DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 119	08	CE 012 598

AUTHOR	Braun, Kurt; And Others
TITLE	Improving Education and Employment Opportunities for the Handicapped: Expanding the Commitment of Vocational and Special Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Bureau of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 77
GRANT	AVTE/IMPED-PCE-A7-040
NOTE	142p.; National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education (Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, October 26-28, 1976)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Legislation; Educational Planning; Educational Programs; Employment Opportunities; Federal Legislation; *Handicapped Students; Higher Education; Program Development; Special Education; Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Education; Universities; *Vocational Education; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Results are presented of a national workshop designed to improve educational and employment opportunities for handicapped and disadvantaged persons by providing a setting for fifteen university teams (one from each of the ten U.S. Office of Education regions and five at large) to develop specific plans of action for the creation or expansion of programs to improve the preparation of vocational education teachers serving the special needs learner. Pre-workshop planning activities are described, including a brief analysis of the 1976 workshop on vocational education for the special needs student. Workshop activities are described; these focused on seven individual presentations relative to special needs programs from three perspectives (vocational education, special education, and a local education agency), legislation affecting vocational education, and the preparation of professional educators. A report of team action planning and strategy sessions is also presented. An evaluation of the workshop follows, along with a report on post-workshop activities which occurred during the seven-month interim between the workshop and the final report. A forty-four-page appendix contains a variety of forms used for the workshop; planning, review, and evaluation instruments; and a team report questionnaire. (BL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED145119

IMPROVING EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE HANDICAPPED: EXPANDING THE COMMITMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

FINAL REPORT

by

Kurt Braun
Len Albright
Rupert Evans

A Report on the

National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education

October 26-28, 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bureau of Educational Research
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

June 30, 1977

CE 012 598

National Workshop Project Staff

Rupert N. Evans, Director
Len Albright, Coordinator
Kurt Braun, Coordinator

The report presented herein was prepared pursuant to Grant No. ST ILL OFC ED AVTE/IMPED PCE-A7-040 from the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education of the Illinois Office of Education and the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of either the Illinois Office of Education or the U.S. Office of Education and no official endorsement should be inferred.

PREFACE

This report is a result of a national workshop designed to improve the educational and employment opportunities for handicapped and disadvantaged persons. The basic strategy employed by the people involved in this project was to encourage the expansion of university-based programs which prepare special and vocational education personnel to serve students with special needs in a vocational setting.

Unfortunately, the genuinely important work in which professional educators are involved often prevents us from reflecting upon the scope of problems faced by handicapped and disadvantaged persons. Statisticans provide some help with comprehensive numercial data which describe in various ways the large numbers of individuals who lack the resources necessary to attain basic life goals. But the personal drama of these individual lives is too often hidden behind the walls of public and private institutions. Still others are lived out in urban and rural areas which are so unpleasant and uncomfortable that we members of the so-called "mainstream" of society construct our daily living patterns in ways which divorce us from this disturbing reality. Perhaps the greatest embarrassment educators have to bear is the realization that it has taken the unrelenting drive of many parents, an increasing number of court decisions and forceful legislative activity to insure that all handicapped children are provided a free and appropriate public education. Fortunately, many educators can take pride in their involvement in both judicial decisions and in the drafting of significant pieces of legislation designed to guarantee the rights of handicapped persons. Other educators, at all levels of the educational system, have struggled and quietly succeeded for years in providing special children with the resources necessary for achieving a productive and meaningful adult life. These past successes, as well as the shortcomings, now provide the basis for expanding the quality of educational opportunities for special needs learners.

A growing number of concerned educators believe that increased cooperation and communication between special and vocational education is necessary before our public schools can provide the special needs student with quality vocational education programs. While many local educational agencies have already increased the quantity and quality of the working relationships between these two professional groups, universities can play at least three important roles in furthering these efforts. First, university special and vocational education departments can set an example by working jointly on most aspects of the problem. Secondly, universities can provide teacher preparation programs which prepare all secondary and post-secondary level educational personnel to better serve the special needs learner. Thirdly, universities can take an important leadership role in the inservice training of experienced educators. The purpose of the national workshop described herein was to provide a setting for 15 university teams to develop specific plans of action for the creation or expansion of programs to fill one or more of these three roles.

It is hoped that this report will be useful to both vocational and special educators who are involved in the process of preparing educational personnel. If the workshop activities, presentations and ideas presented in this report are in any way a help to teacher educators, administrators, teachers and others concerned with the vocational programming for special needs learners, it will have accomplished its purpose.

The national workshop and this resulting report was made possible through the support and assistance of a number of individuals and agencies. Len Albright, Project Coordinator and co-author of the original project proposal, had the major responsibility for organizing the workshop, the project newsletter and the teacher education resource guide.

As project coordinator, Kurt Braun provided important assistance in planning and coordinating many of the project and workshop activities, including the preparation of this report.

The members of our steering committee provided direction and support for several important aspects of the workshop. A list of these individuals and their respective institutions can be found in Appendix A.

The assistance provided by staff members of the Illinois Office of Education and the U.S. Office of Education contributed significantly to the project effort. Glee Saunders, Duane Nielson, William Reynolds and James Haire deserve special thanks for their help. Also, our sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Joseph M. Cronin, Superintendent of Education, State of Illinois for his participation in our workshop. His personal comments during the initial session of the program were most welcomed and well received.

A very special note of gratitude is due Mr. Vance Engleman, for serving as coordinator of the small group work sessions. Vance played a key role in orienting group facilitators and participants to these sessions.

We are also indebted to James C. Barrett, Donn Brolin, Jeanice Midgett, Charles Nichols, L. Allen Phelps and Warren Suzuki for their contributions as facilitators of the small group sessions. Tom Erekson, John Fabac, Nona Janssen, Ken Lorino, Kevin Van Cott and Tim Vogelsberg provided important assistance as group recorders.

The efficient and effective staff of the Bureau of Educational Research, under the direction of Dr. William P. McLure, contributed immeasurably to the project. Secretaries Carma Diel, Shirley Lockard, Louine Friese and Karen Chelsvig provided important assistance. Ms. Diel's management of the financial aspects of the project was superb.

Ms. Anne Brinckerhoff is to be commended for her excellent editorial work on the initial draft of the workshop presentations. Mr. Delmar Burgin of the College of Education also deserves commendation for his assistance with the fiscal accounting of the project.

Finally, the project staff want to extend a sincere thanks to the national workshop participants. Their willingness to share ideas and their enthusiasm toward addressing the "special needs in special needs" personifies the cooperative spirit necessary for expanding and strengthening the quality of educational services delivered to students who have special needs.

Kurt Braun
Len Albright
Rupert Evans

July, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

SECTION I: PRE-WORKSHOP PLANNING ACTIVITIES 1

Introduction 2
Stage 1 - Analyses of the January, 1976 Workshop 2
Stage 2 - Steering Committee Meeting 4
Stage 3 - Mini-Proposal Dissemination Letter 5
Stage 4 - Team Selection 5

SECTION II: THE NATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION WORKSHOP 7

Introduction 8
A. Workshop Program 9
B. Workshop Presentations 14

A Local Education Agency Perspective: Special Needs Programming at Calhoun Area Vocational Center, *Robert A. Harberts* 15
The Vocational Education Perspective, *Rupert N. Evans* . . 18
The Special Education Perspective, *Gary M. Clark* 21
The Preparation of Educators and the Concept of Work, *Harry S. Broudy* 27
Legislation and the Professional Educator, *Reginald Petty* 33
Recent Legislation and Issues Affecting Vocational Education for the Handicapped, *Bill Halloran* 37
Workshop Summary and Observations, *Betty Marion* 43

C. Group Activities 46

Session III: Assessment Activity I - Identification of Issues of Import to the Design of Special Needs Personnel Preparation Programs 47
Session V: Assessment Activity II - Strategies for Attacking the Issues 47
Session VI: Team Action Planning Session 48
Optional Mini-Sessions 49
Session VII: Cross-Review of Team Action Plans 49
Session VIII: The Most Innovative Aspect of Our Action and Workshop Summary 50

SECTION III: EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP 51

Introduction 52
Group Activities 52
Presentations 55
Resource Materials Display 55

The Workshop as a Whole 57
Strengths and Weaknesses 57
Conclusions 57

SECTION IV: POST-WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES 60

Introduction 61
Post-Workshop Project Activities 61
Follow-up Team Funding 61
Inservice Resource Guide 62
The Project Newsletter 62
The Teacher Education Resource Guide 62
Final Project Report 63
Post-Workshop Team Activities 63
Course/Program Development 63
University Staff Development 64
Exploration of Funding Sources 64
Communication/Cooperation 64
Inservice Teacher Education 64
Summary 64

APPENDIX A: STEERING COMMITTEE ROSTER 66
APPENDIX B: AGENDA - STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING 68
APPENDIX C: WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENT LETTER 70
APPENDIX D: MINI-PROPOSAL APPLICATION FORM 73
APPENDIX E: GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE MINI-PROPOSAL 77
APPENDIX F: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND INSTITUTIONS 79
APPENDIX G: DISCUSSION MATRIX FOR ISSUE IDENTIFICATION 85
APPENDIX H: DISCUSSION MATRIX FOR DEVELOPING STRATEGIES 87
APPENDIX I: INSTITUTIONAL ACTION PLANNING INSTRUMENT 89
APPENDIX J: CROSS - REVIEW INSTRUMENT 96
APPENDIX K: WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENT 99
APPENDIX L: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL DISPLAYED AT THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP 104
APPENDIX M: TEAM PROGRESS REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE 110

SECTION I

PRE-WORKSHOP PLANNING ACTIVITIES

PRE-WORKSHOP PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Introduction

This project was an outgrowth of, and, in many respects, a continuation of the January, 1976 National Teacher Education Workshop on Vocational Education for the Special Needs Student.[1] From the outset, the staff of the present project (FY77) decided to build upon the findings of the January, 1976 workshop to create a workshop environment which would be most conductive to, and productive for designing university-based action plans.

The pre-workshop planning was accomplished in four stages. The first stage involved analyses of the January, 1976 (FY76) workshop evaluation. The FY 76 evaluation was very comprehensive and proved, as expected, to be an important resource throughout the 1977 fiscal year. This information was most helpful in preparing a tenative workshop agenda and other recommendations for the second stage of workshop planning: the steering committee meeting of July 27, 1976.

In addition to making important suggestions concerning the proposed workshop agenda, the steering committee outlined strategies and resources which ultimately proved to be very important to the participants of the October, 1976 workshop. The steering committee also provided key suggestions for the design and dissemination of workshop application materials (the third stage), and offered pertinent considerations for the selection of 15 university-based teams (the fourth stage of the pre-workshop planning).

Stage 1 - Analyses of the January, 1976 Workshop

Two open-ended questions within the January workshop evaluation questionnaire addressed the overall strengths and weaknesses of that workshop. They were: 1) What were one or two major strengths of this workshop?; and 2) What were one or two major weaknesses of this workshop? Participant responses to these items were classified into major categories as identified in Table 1.

---

[1] For further information on the FY 76 project the reader is directed to Vocational Education for the Special Needs Student: Competencies and Models for Personnel Preparation by Phelps, L. A.; Evans, R. N.; Abbas, E. K.; and Frison, K. D. (ED 132 303)

TABLE 1

Participant Response to January, 1976 National Workshop

Strengths	Weaknesses
1. Presentations	1. Presentations
2. Workshop Planning and Organization	2. Limited amount of time for interaction and discussion between and within teams
3. Interaction and exchange of ideas	3. The professional task analysis activity
4. Team approach	4. Lack of variety of materials
5. Joint vocational and special education involvement	
6. The location (away from home)	

Through further analysis of other sections of the January workshop evaluation, conversations with FY 76 project staff, selected participants and FY 77 steering committee members, some explanations were found which clarified the paradox of presentations being rated as both the major strength and the major weakness. This anomaly "may be indicative... that the teams were at different stages of development in terms of their university program" (Phelps, et. al., p. 88). Several presentations were generally well received and although these presentations were not repeated outright, they did provide examples and direction for the October, 1976 workshop presentations. Additional analyses and discussion led the project staff and the steering committee to conclude that the presentations for the second workshop should be tied more directly to individual team action planning efforts, e.g., presentations concerning teacher education and local education agency perspectives, legislation, funding and issues surrounding interdisciplinary planning at the teacher education level.

Similarly, preliminary planning activities suggested that an increase in group activities designed to facilitate discussion and dialogue between individual and team participants would appear to be profitable. While the specifics of the group activities were not developed until after the July 27 steering committee meeting, four group sessions appeared in the tentative workshop agenda, in part as a result of the analyses referred to above. These were: 1) needs assessment; 2) strategy assessment; 3) individual team meetings; and 4) a cross-review session. Several activities which were less successful, or judged by the previous evaluation were revised or eliminated from the proposed agenda.

Stage 2 - Steering Committee Meeting

On July 27, 1976 the project steering committee met with the staff to review and discuss project policies and to suggest strategies for accomplishing stated project goals. Much of the steering committee work was manifested in the October, 1976 workshop program.

Steering committee membership included a mix of vocational and special educators representing local education agency, university, state and federal government and professional organization perspectives. The steering committee roster and the meeting agenda appear in Appendices A and B.

The committee's first task was to assist in formulating the criteria and selection process for the 15 institutional teams. Representatives from special and vocational education were considered essential for team composition. Representation from each of the ten U.S.O.E. Regions was seen as critical for insuring national representation. It was recommended that one team be selected from each U.S.O.E. Region and 5 be selected on an at-large basis. Striking a balance between established, new and planned special needs teacher education programs was also deemed desirable. Furthermore, it was suggested that preservice and inservice programs be valued equally in the selection process. In order to strengthen team efforts during and following the workshop, representation from state departments of education was to be sought.

Considerable time was spent on the design of the workshop agenda. Small group sessions and pertinent presentations were seen as the major vehicles for assisting teams in the development of their action plan. The steering committee reinforced and expanded upon project staff plans which focused on maximizing individual and team participant input during the workshop. The committee was supportive of involving selected January, 1976 participant, in the October, 1976 workshop proceedings.

Following the discussion of workshop activities, the committee reviewed the proposed instruments and procedures for facilitating institutional action planning. The mini-proposal application used during the FY 76 project was modified so as to clarify past, present and proposed team activities, and several other, minor, modifications were made in the team action planning instrument.

Finally, the steering committee discussed proposed project staff follow-up activities. A newsletter, comprised of articles and news items written by the project staff and interested workshop participants was recommended. Other follow-up activities related to team funding provisions and the development of a teacher education resource guide were suggested.

Stage 3 - Mini-Proposal Dissemination Letter

Multiple copies of the workshop announcements, mini-proposal forms and guidelines were sent to each state Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) coordinator and each state Part D-Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) training program coordinator. Each coordinator was asked to distribute this information to applicable universities throughout his/her state. In addition, single copies of the announcement, the mini-proposal form and related guidelines were sent to universities considered to have an interest in the goals of this project. Over 200 packets were distributed to universities throughout the country. A copy of the workshop announcement letter appears in Appendix C. The mini-proposal form and guidelines for completing this form can be found in Appendices D and E respectively.

Dissemination of the workshop announcements and mini-proposal information was completed by the second week of August, 1976. The deadline for mini-proposal submission was September 8, allowing roughly 3 weeks for preparation. While this deadline appeared early in the academic year, it allowed for a relatively early workshop date (October) and perhaps more importantly, each team which participated then had seven months between the workshop and the final team progress report. This interim period is approximately three months longer than the time-span offered to the teams involved in the FY 76 project. This extended time period also afforded the FY 77 project staff more time to broaden staff follow-up activities (see Section III for an expanded discussion on this topic).

Stage 4 - Team Selection

A total of 34 mini-proposals were received by the September 8 deadline. Selection of the 15 participant teams was completed by the last week of September, 1976.

All mini-proposals were reviewed and categorized according to the following criteria: 1) U.S.O.E. Region represented; 2) planned, new or established program; 3) program type (preservice, inservice workshop degree program etc.); 4) population served (e.g., vocational teachers, special education teachers, coordinators, counselors or administrators); 5) single university or consortium; 6) team composition (Four members were to be identified, of whom at least one was to be from vocational education and one from special education).

The project staff reviewed all mini-proposals and together selected the 15 teams to be invited to the workshop, using criteria approved by the steering committee. The ten teams representing each U.S.O.E. Region were selected first, followed by the selection of five teamsoon an at-large basis. A list of the 15 teams selected for workshop participation is located in Appendix F. The planned variation method, based on the aforementioned criteria, assured diverse team representation at the workshop.

The project staff was pleased with the number of mini-proposals received. In contrast to the FY 76 project, applicants for the October workshop were asked to pay travel and lodging expenses for one-half of their proposed team. Also, the time period for submitting the mini-proposal application was considerably shorter than the FY 76 project time period. In light of these two differences, the project staff felt substantial commitments were made by the submitting institutions. This response also suggests that the notion of, and the need for, cooperative team planning by special and vocational educators at the teacher education level is widely recognized and well received across the nation. It was indeed unfortunate that project capabilities did not permit all applicants to participate in the October workshop.

SECTION II - THE NATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION WORKSHOP

A. Workshop Program

B. Presentations

C. Group Activities

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the activities which occurred at the national workshop. It includes the program of activities, each of the major presentations delivered, and the group discussion processes and activities. The group activities were sequenced in conjunction with the presentations. Although these events are discussed separately in this report, Table 2 (which follows the workshop agenda) is provided to illustrate the relationships among various presentations and group activities.

A - Workshop Program

PROGRAM

National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education

University of Illinois
October 26-28, 1976

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26

8:30 - 9:00 a.m. - Registration, Illini Room C, Illini Union

SESSION I: SPECIAL NEEDS IN SPECIAL NEEDS: PERSPECTIVES

9:00 - 11:15 a.m. - Illini Room C

Introductions: Rupert N. Evans, Workshop Director

Welcome: J. Myron Atkin, Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois

Presenters:
Robert A. Harberts and Wayne Booten, Calhoun Area Vocational Center, Battle Creek, Michigan
"A Local Education Agency Perspective"
Rupert N. Evans, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois
"The Vocational Education Perspective"
Gary M. Clark, Professor of Special Education, University of Kansas
"The Special Education Perspective"

11:15 - 11:30 a.m. - Orientation to afternoon sessions
Vance Engleman, Consultant, Southwest Regional Resource Center, Salt Lake City, Utah

Lunch - 11:45 - 12:30 p.m. Illini Room A

SESSION II: THE CONCEPT OF WORK IN THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATORS

12:30 - 1:15 p.m. - Illini Room A

Introduction: Rupert N. Evans

Speaker: Harry S. Broudy, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois

SESSION III: MINI-PROPOSAL REVIEW - ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY I: IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES OF IMPORT TO THE DESIGN OF SPECIAL NEEDS PERSONNEL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

1:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Small Group Sessions - Vance Engleman, Coordinator

Group	Meeting Site	Facilitators
Group A	Illini C	Warren Suzuki, Oregon State University
Group B	Room 261	Jeanice Midgett, Florida Technological University
Group C	Room 263	Charles Nichols, Kent State University
Group D	Room 267	Donn Brolin, University of Missouri

Social Hour - 5:30 - 6:30 p.m. Levis Faculty Center

Dinner - 6:30 - 7:30 p.m. Levis Faculty Center

SESSION IV: UPDATE: LEGISLATION AND FUNDING

7:30 - 9:00 p.m. - Levis Faculty Center

Introductions: Len Albright, Workshop Coordinator

Presenters: Reginald Petty, Executive Director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

William Halloran, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27

SESSION V: ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY II: STRATEGIES FOR ATTACKING THE ISSUES

8:30 - 11:30 a.m. Illini C

Orientation to Task Force Activity -
Formation of Task Force Groups -

Corodinators: Kurt Braun, Workshop Coordinator and Vance Engleman, Session Coordinator

Lunch - 12:00 - 12:45 p.m. Illini Room A

SESSION VI: TASK FORCE REPORTS - INSTITUTIONAL ACTION PLANNING

1:00 - 2:00 p.m. - Illini C

Task Force Reports - Coordinator: Vance Engleman
Reporters: Group Facilitators

2:00 - 2:20 p.m. - Illini C

Orientation to Action Planning Activity - Len Albright

2:20 - 5:00 p.m. -

Institutional Team Meetings

Dinner (on your own)

7:00 - ?

Institutional Team Meetings

8:30 -

Optional Mini-Sessions (Topics and Location to be announced Wed. p.m.)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28

SESSION VII: CROSS-REVIEW OF TEAM ACTION PLANS

8:15 - 9:45 a.m. - Illini C

Team and Room Assignments to be announced Workshop Staff

SESSION VIII: OBSERVATIONS

10:00 - 11:00 a.m.

Team Reports: "The Most Innovative Aspect of Our Plan"

Presenters: Team Captains

11:00 - 11:30 a.m.

Workshop Summary

Presenters: Betty Marion, Essex County Voc. Schools, N.J.
Rupert N. Evans

11:30 a.m.

Workshop Evaluation

12:00

Adjournment

20

TABLE 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRESENTATIONS AND GROUP ACTIVITIES

Common Function	Session	Presentation	Group Activity
Needs Assessment and Problem Identification	I	Vocational Education Perspective	
	I	Special Education Perspective	
	I	Local Education Agency Perspective	
	II	Concept of Work	
	III		Needs Assessment Activity
Resource Identification	IV	Update on Legislation and Funding	
	V		Strategy Assessment
	VI		Task Force Reports
	VI		Optional Mini-Sessions
Planning	VI		Action Planning Activity
Feedback	VII		Cross Review Activity
Closure	VIII		Most Innovative Aspect
	VIII	Workshop Summary	

B - Workshop Presentations

A LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY PERSPECTIVE

SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAMMING AT CALHOUN AREA VOCATIONAL CENTER

Robert A. Harberts, Director
Calhoun Area Vocational Center
Battle Creek, MI

Before I get started I would like to thank you for asking us to come to this national workshop to discuss our Special Needs project. Our project has been rated by the U.S.O.E. as one of the best integrated programs in the country, and we are always pleased to discuss it. I am particularly pleased that you are exploring teacher preparation in Special Needs at the national level. Hopefully such exploration will lead to more meaningful preparation and skills maintenance programs for vocational instructors. By listening to us you are finding out exactly what is needed on the firing line.

Our Special Needs project is an integral part of our daily operation. It represents about 30% of our students and all of our staff with emphasis on six (6) specialized counselors. We have been charged by our Policy Advisory Committee and the area Boards of Education to accept all students as they are, and to enroll them all in the same programs. These groups have in effect mandated Special Needs and mainstreaming as a part of our operating philosophy.

The community expects the same. The parents and students expect us to serve all students. They do not want all the college prep students or all the potential drop-outs and push-outs to attend. They expect any student to enter the Center and exit with some type of saleable job skills. This is a monumental task.

We believe in mainstreaming because it brings dignity and understanding to all students and all occupations. It is a difficult assignment for the staff. Life would be much easier for all of us if we were dealing with just the students that want to learn. It is not easy to deal with a slow learner, a student who cannot read, one that sleeps when you lecture, one with a severe physical handicap, or one that does not bother to come to class. We very often must remind ourselves that the schools are for the students and not the staff. Becoming student centered is important to teaching all students. As I see it, worrying about their jobs instead of ours is part of being student centered.

There is no way the C.A.V.C. could assist the disadvantaged students and the mentally and physically handicapped without our Special Needs project. To me as an Administrator, it means that 30% more of our students will be successful, the staff will gain much more satisfaction from their teaching and the employers will turn to us for our product.

As you know a vocational teacher does not need a degree to teach in his area of expertise. At the Center our staff is about 50% degreed and 50% non-degreed. When we started in 1970, our degreed staff members were no better at handling Special Needs students than were our non-degree staff. In fact in many cases the degreed staff members were less effective.

Our staff did not come to the Center with the skills to handle Special Needs students. In seven (7) years we will have spent about $150,000 on in-service to help our staff better work with all students.

We have had many variations of in-service. Presently many of our instructional staff members are receiving up to five (5) days of in-service/month. Two to three weeks each summer are devoted to in-service. Many instructors are enrolled in college courses to eliminate skill deficiencies. We are training center staff members to be trainers so that we will have an on-going inservice program. Pay incentives are given to instructors to encourage professional growth. Everyone at the Center is on an incentive pay program which includes merit pay increases.

We are presently working with Carkhauff & Associates of Amherst, Massachusetts to develop and implement the cluster concept in vocational education. This has been made possible through a grant from the U.S.O.E. The staff is excited about the cluster in-service sessions and eager to learn.

There were not and still are not many instructors with the skills we are looking for. Because of this we must spend much time with in-service as well as accepting lesser goals for the Center.

What can we do to better prepare all the students that come to us? The answer to this is in what types of skills each staff member possesses.

I have outlined three (3) instructional staff skill areas that I would like to expand upon with you:

The first. To serve all vocational students a teacher is needed that can understand and change human behavior. He must be able to take someone that cannot learn or will not learn and help him set and then reach a career goal. These are the "people" skills, and to me are the most important and often neglected in education. We need people, not "people machines" teaching. I am not implying that each teacher must have years of experience in psychology. I am saying teachers must be able to apply the inter-personal skills of attending, responding, personalizing and initiating. They must be able to listen to a student to find out what he is really saying and what he really wants and then do something about it. Our staff has enjoyed and learned more from inter-personal skills workshops than anything we have developed. Since we have gotten into inter-personal skills, discipline problems have been cut in half. This means being more effective with Special Needs students. These skills are needed by all staff members that come in contact with students. Program Managers, Secretaries, Aides and Administrators all need to operationalize these skills. Without interpersonal skills it is nearly impossible for staff members to explore and understand what the student wants from the school.

The second skill area a teacher must possess is a good working background in program development. To reach all students the instruction must be individualized. Each student must be allowed to reach his own goal using his own learning style. This means the teacher must be able to write performance objectives, objective referenced tests and learning modules. A teacher that has Special Needs student(s) must have the skill of modifying the cluster curriculum. He or she must be able to take a cluster's tasks or steps and turn them into a Special Needs student's goals. For example, most Transportation Clusters are written so that a task would be something like "changing spark plugs." For a Special Needs student "changing spark plugs" may be the goal. The instructor must be able to break down this goal into objectives, tasks and steps so that it can be achievable by the Special Needs student.

The third skill area is a set of delivery skills and actual content experiences in career development and career preparation. That is to say the instructors must have their career development and career preparation skills together as related to their cluster area. Good training and experience are essential in these skills if the instructors are expected to teach them to the students. Vo-Ed is more than just the "hands-on" work of the past. It also includes the needed skills of career development. Making career plans and decisions, writing a resume, filling out an application and interviewing are all skills the instructor must have and then be able to give the students. A student must be given the skills necessary to recognize his strong points so that he can inform a potential employer of them. I am talking about fact based assets. A student with these career development skills will have a much better chance of finding and getting employment equal to his/her values.

The career preparation skills are also needed by instructors. These are the "skills of the trade" the student is learning. The instructors must know these skills well enough to break them into workable learning units for all students. Instructors should give the student the opportunity to learn by doing. Allowing the student to learn in environments other than school is essential. Skills can be reinforced in the home and on the job as well as in school.

With the demands being placed on vocational educators, training in these three (3) skill areas is extremely important. If the instructor can use his program development skills to step out the content and effectively utilize his delivery skills and inter-personal skills he will be able to teach all kids especially the often unteachable the Special Needs students. Using our Special Needs project and the U.S. Cluster project as the vehicles, these are the skills we are trying to give our staff at the Calhoun Area Vocational Center. These are the skills that I feel all vocational educators must have. If the educators are not competent in these areas a school will be less than effective. If the instructors do not have these skills it will be extremely difficult to be successful with Special Needs students. They are the students that need the good teachers! Thank you.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSPECTIVE

Rupert N. Evans
Professor of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois

The preceding speakers have carefully laid out for us some of the problems that we face. I'd like to go one step further by making a few comments about the role of vocational educators in the educational development of the handicapped and the disadvantaged. First, however, I would like to say a few words about the students we want to serve.

Some of you may have been a bit turned off by one of the terms used in the new legislation. I refer, of course, to the phrase "special needs students". Some people get uptight about that term. We don't want you to. It is designed to include instruction of students who are sometimes classified as handicapped and sometimes classified as disadvantaged and sometimes classified as both handicapped and disadvantaged. There is no doubt, in my mind, however, that we vocational educators have more of a problem with the education of the handicapped than we do with the disadvantaged. In part, I think this is because of the experience of people in vocational education. Many vocational educators don't like to admit it, but especially at the high school level, vocational education has concentrated on serving the disadvantaged. More or less by guess and by gosh, learning as we go, we have acquired some skills in dealing with at least some people who would be classified as disadvantaged. But by and large vocational education has not dealt effectively with the handicapped. This is not to say that vocational education cannot improve in dealing with the disadvantaged. I'm convinced that as we acquire skills that enable us to deal more effectively with the handicapped we'll also acquire some skills that will help us in working with other kinds of disadvantaged. But let's think a minute about this handicapped group. As you know, there are various estimates about the number of the handicapped. Twenty-five million persons, or one-eigth of our population is a fairly well accepted figure. I'm convinced that every one of these folks can benefit from special education regardless of their age.

You'll have an opportunity this evening to see a film that Marc Gold has prepared in which you'll see Marc working with a person who has been blind and deaf since birth. This twenty-one year old is just about as hard to teach as anyone can imagine. Every time I see this film I'm further convinced that if we have people who know what they are doing, and if we're willing to invest the necessary time and effort, there is no one in the handicapped group who cannot be reached by vocational education. But there's a world of difference between a program which really meets the needs of all the students and the typical vocational education program in which we have admission requirements stated very often as "the ability to profit from the instruction which is being offered". The kind of program we are talking about says that we are going to serve all, come hell or high water.

Now, one of the paradoxes in vocational education for the disadvantaged and for the handicapped, but especially for the handicapped, is that vocational education knows pretty well what to teach them but it doesn't know how to teach them. Two groups are much more knowledgeable about how to teach the handicapped: vocational rehabilitation specialists and special educators. Vocational rehabilitation, as you know, has been mostly concerned with post-secondary age students. On the other hand, special education has been mostly concerned with elementary school age students and younger. The adolescent group has been very much neglected. Vocational rehabilitation has been mostly concerned with the purchase of vocational education services. It is extremely good at the evaluation of these services, but not as good, to my way of thinking, in terms of providing these services. Their ability to evaluate services is important and needed. If, just for purposes of discussion, you accept this analysis that vocational education knows what to teach this group but not how to teach it, and that special education knows much about how to teach it but not enough about what to teach, then it certainly makes a great deal of sense for us to pool the expertise of the two groups, and perhaps to add the evaluation skills of vocational rehabilitation.

Now, think about the program that Wayne and Robert have outlined for us here. As nearly as I can tell, this is one of the best programs that we have around. It can be improved; they work every day at trying to improve it. But compared to what is available in most of our communities or even in most of our states, it is like a beacon. But how do we get staff for programs like Robert's and Wayne's? Isn't it a sad situation for them to have to stand here in front of us, and they're not lying to us at all; isn't it a sad situation when they say that the professionally trained teachers that they get are not any more effective than folks who are recruited directly out of business and industry, put to work as teachers with no college training whatever (or a minimum of it at any rate) and these folks without any special preparation in teaching can teach as effectively, by and large? What Wayne and Robert have to do is to provide a combination of on-the-job training accompanied by inservice instruction designed and provided by the local school system. (I know that they purchase some inservice services every once and a while but still it's basically a bootstrap operation.) These folks start out to run a program. They recruit the best teachers they can. These teachers are not good enough to do the job, but they learn on the job, which means they learn by observation and trial and error, helped a bit by locally designed inservice education. The pattern of staff development they are using is one of two that makes a great deal of sense. Let me repeat, it is one of two patterns of staff development that make any sense to me. They've had to choose that one of the two because it has been all that was available, but let's think a minute about another possibility of staff development. Very simply, this is a program of (1) preservice staff development, accompanied by and followed by (2) on-the-job training and (3) supplemented by inservice instruction, with the preservice provided by teacher education institutions which are involved in the inservice program. Based on where we are now, there's no question in my mind but that both of these patterns of staff development are going to have to be utilized. But, how can we utilize them? How can we improve them? How can we provide them? We don't know.

I've been engaged for the last year or so in a study of the more general problem of what kinds of skills can best be taught on the job and what kinds of skills can best be taught in a formal laboratory classroom setting. We have identified twenty-four variables that indicate that in certain cases on-the-job training is the best way of learning a skill, and in other situations classroom or laboratroy instruction is the best way of learning a skill. An absolute firm conclusion of this study is that both of them have to be used. Equally firm is the feeling that if you are running a local educational system and you cannot get staff who have had the kinds of skills that can best be provided through formal classroom and laboratory instruction, then on-the-job training is going to have to do, whether or not it is theoretically as effective as formal instruction for teaching each part of the job of being a teacher.

Almost a year ago we had ten teacher education teams here, one from each region of the country, looking at the question of how we can do a better job of providing staff to serve special needs students. We found then, just as we found in the selection of this year's fifteen teams, that there are some universities that have special education and no vocational education, some that have vocational education and no special education, and some that have special education and part (but not all) of vocational education. We encouraged folks to form consortia, some of which worked quite well and some of which didn't get off the ground at all. As we followed up last year's ten teams we think we've learned a little bit about how staff can best be developed, but we surely have a long way to go. Basically that's why we asked you to come to learn with us. We have here fifteen teams selected as the best in the country, not selected on the basis of geographic representation, but as the best we could get. We are looking to you for two things and two things only. We are looking to you, in your unique situation, for a staff development plan that will work where you are. Secondly, we are looking to you for ideas on how to help other folks in meeting staff development needs in other different kinds of situations. These expectations sound very simple and they are very simple, on the surface. Unfortunately, the task of serving special needs persons is like any other complicated task; the further you get into it, the more you realize how complicated it is. Together, we can begin to unravel some of these complexities.

THE SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSPECTIVE

Gary M. Clark
Department of Special Education
University of Kansas

This workshop is an attempt to facilitate cooperative efforts in teacher education between vocational and special educators. This involves communication within and across fields in facing some of the issues in cooperative teacher education. I want to use the time given me to focus on some issues which are important to this dialogue and, in doing so, will undoubtedly be reflecting the special education perspective--at least as one special educator views it.

The first of these issues is the acknowledgement by special educators that prevocational training is not vocational training. Rupert (Evans) is right that the emphasis for so long has been on the elementary and preschool age child. Special education personnel preparation programs have got to take into account some of the differences between elementary and secondary education, as has been done in regular education for years. Secondly, this admission or acknowledgement implies that the need exists for personnel who not only can provide prevocational training and certain occupational training, but also who can serve as resource persons or team members with vocational and technical educators. This is a major shift from the kinds of preparation we have been involved with in the past. Given the acknowledgement that we do not know as much about vocational education as we do about prevocational training, we have to look at what has been and is happening in this area.

To begin with, many special educators are not aware of the implications and the impact, for example, of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The kinds of changes that it brought about resulted in a variety of programs sponsored by state and local schools and state educational institutions for the handicapped and disadvantaged. Special needs students, as they are so frequently called, have been identified in schools, and special education occupational programs have been initiated directly as a result of this legislation. Many of the youngsters in these new programs had been in our special education programs or perhaps should have been at some time but never were so identified and so placed. There is no doubt that the population being served through these new special needs programs includes students that we have been concerned about, or should have been much more concerned about, for a long time. There is also no doubt that many of the youngsters in these programs have been given something for the first time, and it's been a long time in coming. This is a population that has been ignored, passively resisted, or actively resisted by others, but are now beginning to get what is their due. There is also no doubt that this program is keeping many youngsters in school who would have dropped out before.

In light of the rapid movement we have in other areas of our society, however, information we have regarding the speed and quality of programming in the implementation of the Vocational Education Amendments is not something we can be particularly proud of. Here it is 1976, and the Amendment came out in 1968. In the last year or two we are just getting together as teacher educators to talk about this problem on a national basis. That makes eight years! You can imagine the lag time existing out in the field in many programs, and often there are no programs at all.

There is a challenge before us and we in special education need to know what is happening in vocational education and be able to plug into that. If we are going to be advocates for our students and for those we have been interested in for so long, we need to know the alternatives. We need to know about the specific kinds of programs in vocational and technical education that are different from our special needs programs. A whole variety of programs may be appropriate for some of our students in business education, vocational distributive education, technical education, vocational agriculture, home economics, vocational industrial education, trades and industry, diversified occupations, and cooperative education programs.

Now, we in special education can look at some of the resistance that has been manifested by our colleagues in vocational education with some understanding and empathy. In the history of vocational and technical education, some of this resistance has come from trying to strive for legitimacy within the academic world. They have been selective in the kinds of students allowed in their programs in order to show that their products did indeed have skills that were marketable, saleable, and that their programs were effective. A legitimate status within the field of education was sought after greatly. There was no desire to be a dumping ground for other areas of education that might get in the way of obtaining legitimacy. We in special education can understand this because we have been a dumping ground. We did not fight it quite so much because our existence depended on being "dumped on," in order to have someone to teach. Our challenge as special educators is to try and understand and be able to communicate with this kind of resistance, but at the same time, be the advocates with vocational educators to assist them in doing what needs to be done. To do this, we first need to be advocates for the students themselves so that they can gain full access to those vocational programs which meet their interests. Secondly, we need to be a supportive resource person to those teachers so that the students can maintain their progress once they get into these programs.

Last year's workshop here at the University of Illinois was interesting in a number of ways, but one thing came through loudly and clearly. In small group discussions, vocational educators were asking two questions of special educators that I would like to share with you. First, "How do you individualize for a person who cannot perform or has limited skills in reading or math?" This relates to the "how" that Rupert was talking about. Secondly, "How do you provide for the safety for those students and those around them if they do have perceptual problems or behavior disorders?" Underlying these concerns was another message to special educators, "give us some help on these problems and we will do it; don't you special educators try to teach vocational education." This goes back to the first point that I was making. They are right. We do not have the skills and knowledge to be vocational educators, but we do need to give them the help to do their job with special needs students.

As we think about the whole mainstreaming movement and the ideas being talked about as a result of Public Law 94-142, misunderstandings arise regarding the meanings of the law and what will actually happen when it is implemented. I have several concerns regarding the idea that vocational education is the alternative for all handicapped students. Although vocational education is appropriate in vocational content and occupational training, preparation for work in the world, is typically deficient in specific training for adult living. In the Calhoun County Vocational Program presented today, I was delighted to see that those other areas of concern that are so important to adjustment in the work world are included in the work program. If as many students who are labelled handicapped, learning disabled, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, socially maladjusted (or whatever fancy label we come up with) come from the kinds of backgrounds that I think they do, as I have observed them, there is no doubt that they need a lot more than specific occupational skills to be able to maintain their jobs. I mean not just get the job or even perform the job, but maintain the job as a worker living in the community. A good case can be made that personal-social skill training for adult living should be a vital part of their educational program. Vocational education has not traditionally assumed this responsibility and usually deviates from it, from our perspective in special needs programs which have really been tuned into these concerns. If this is a needed area, who is going to provide it? I am not suggesting that vocational education should assume this responsibility, I am just saying that somebody should provide it. As youngsters are being moved into regular programs, my concern is that somebody is not going to assume this responsibility and see that they get these kinds of prevocational and adult living skills.

My second concern is that in many programs vocational education has been, and still is, taught at a level of instruction that is difficult or even inappropriate for those who have serious educational deficiencies. I am talking about the level of instruction that involves reading and math skills. Depending on the vocational or technical area of instruction this will vary, but most do incorporate complex technical readings, whether it involves diagrams or narrative material. If you are like me and have tried to read those manuals to put together a child's toy, you'll find yourself educationally handicapped. If we are going to provide students with coping skills and study skills and their teachers with practical workable instructional strategies, we are going to have to get our house in order in special education. Our bluff has been called. We in special education have been criticizing vocational education for not doing what should have been done for a long time, and now vocational educators, by and large, are saying, "O.K. we're willing, tell us how to do it." We are caught short because we have not been doing our homework enough to be able to give them the kind of resource assistance that is needed and in the amount that is needed. The people who have these kinds of skills and knowledge in teacher education are so few and far between across the U.S. that it is quite frightening.

A second critical issue or consideration has to be the impact of Public Law 94-142. I know some of you are getting tired of hearing that, but you are going to hear a lot more about it in the next two-three years. I think it is the most significant legislative event to date, educationally, and will historically be considered among some of the most significant civil rights legislation. In fact, Public Law 94-142 is a kind of civil rights legislation. It has profound implications for what we are about. Whether appropriations accompany it or not, we are going to have to learn to deal with a federal mandate which tells us that we are supposed to provide a free appropriate education to all handicapped children and youth of school age. A lot of states already have had this kind of mandate, but I know some states where the mandate has not been enforced. The mandate has been there but the detailed, explicit specifications have not. For those of you who are not familiar with this law, the critical element is the provision for an individualized educational program or plan for every handicapped student in our schools. This individualized educational plan is to be a written statement jointly prepared and developed by (1) a qualified school official, (2) by the child's or youth's teacher, (3) by one or both of the parents or guardians, and (4) when possible, by the child himself. This statement, worked out together, or in collaboration has to include a number of things very specifically spelled out in the law. It must include an analysis of the student's present achievement level, both short range and annual goals, an identification of specific services that will be provided towards meeting these goals, an indication of the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular school programs, a notation of when these services will be provided and how long they will last, and finally an accountability specification--a schedule for checking on the progress being achieved under the plan and for making modifications in it. This is a block-buster of a bill. I don't think we fully realize the implications of what it is we are in for as we try to implement Public Law 94-142.

Another issue that I want to talk about has to do with changing populations in the field. The nature of the populations that we're dealing with have come about from some of the state mandates. More severely handicapped have been placed in classes that previously held only the mildly handicapped. Many who are moving out into the regular programs are making it, and those who were previously served in very isolated programs for the moderately handicapped and those who had been institutionalized (or were not being served at all) are moving up into those self-contained special classes. The implication emerging from this is that many of these students are now saying, "I want to go to high school." Before, we would see this at the preschool or elementary level. The implication is that while we have a supportive responsibility to vocational educators for those students in a traditional vocational education program or a special needs vocational education program, we probably will retain primary responsibility as special educators for handicapped students who are not in specific vocational education programs, yet who have vocational and prevocational needs. Can we, or even should we, claim sole responsibility for this, however, without asking for reciprocal support from vocational educators, just as they are asking for our support with the mildly handicapped? We in special education have grossly underestimated the ability and the potential of even the mildly handicapped. If we do not think in terms of vocational programming for the moderately and severely handicapped we are certainly repeating our performance. Marc Gold has demonstrated the potential of severely handicapped youth and he has challenged our expectations for all handicapped.

We in special education have concentrated mainly on daily living skills and self-help skills. The challenges of both prevocational and vocational programming are critical issues for us in these times.

Finally, without being pessimistic or trying to say we have such a hard job, I do think that for communication purposes it is worthwhile to put before us some of the obstacles that we know are there, so that we can look at them together as two different disciplines and deal with them out in the open, rather than have them emerge through hidden agendas and hidden motives in our discussions. There are innumerable obstacles that can get in our way but they are not insurmountable. If we look at the state of the art they come out time and time again. In 1973 we at the University of Kansas hosted a regional conference in Kansas City for state administrators in the fields of vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation and developmental disabilities from Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas. A lot of these obstacles emerged in terms of the state level efforts for cooperation. They apply to us in teacher education and so I want to share some of them with you so that we can get them out in the open and acknowledge them.

They include the following:

1. Minimal amounts of communication between or among groups concerning programming is common.

2. Narrow (sometime elitist) views held by the various agencies exist, suggesting that their respective agency has "the" answer(s).

3. Agencies function under different administrative departments.

4. State plans for various agencies are prepared in relative, if not virtual, isolation.

5. Conflicting philosophies exist.

6. A competitive interagency spirit exists, created by categorical aid whereby funding sources charge several different agencies with the same responsibility.

7. Shortages of staff and funds are realities.

8. A pre-occupation or over-concern with carrying out regulatory requirements prevails.

In summary, I would like to make a general statement in perspective for each of the basic issues that I have mentioned: 1) vocational programming is not the same as prevocational programming, 2) populations are changing, 3) the impact of Public Law 94-142 must be acknowledged, and 4) innumberable potential barriers and obstacles exist. First, vocational programming is not prevocational programming and as such is not the area of strength of the field of special education. The charge for special educators at this point is for teacher preparation programs to broaden their scope beyond instruction in academic and personal social competencies to include support and advocacy roles of our teachers in training to ensure that vocational education opportunities are provided at the highest level possible for our secondary handicapped disadvantaged youth. Second, prevocational and occupational training for the more severely handicapped remaining in special education classes is the primary responsibility of special educators, but we need the support of vocational education. The direct charge is to make some quick, but adequate, adaptations to our current training models that we have found successful in training teachers to work with the mildly handicapped, so that the changing populations and their needs will be met. We need to draw on the resources of vocational and technical education to support us in this role. Third, Public Law 94-142 calls for all teachers of handicapped students to be appropriately trained. The law puts this responsibility on the local and state educational agencies, and not on higher education. We have to be ready to submit a plan to these agencies as to how the college or university should and can be involved in preparing teachers so that they are "appropriately trained." Finally, in facing the innumerable potential barriers to cooperative personnel preparation, we need to experience what we advocate for the handicapped themselves -- the dignity of risk -- and enter into cooperative relationships with honesty and candor. We have to begin with communication centered on the needs of handicapped and disadvantaged youth, rather than territorial or departmental needs. This requires an approach with open motives focused on wanting to serve youth with special needs and assist schools in compliance with the law, rather than an approach with hidden motives related to competition for funds, reward systems, or professional status.

As special educators, we have something to offer in terms of knowledge of the needs and characteristics of handicapped youth. Vocational education needs us. We also need vocational education, as it has as much to offer us, as we have for it. The very term "vocational programming for the handicapped" makes no assumptions about where it takes place, who does it, or the current existence of any specific discipline or body of knowledge. It does assume that the program is specific or appropriate for the vocational needs of handicapped individuals. Our state of the art suggests that the two fields most concerned with these two factors must jointly work toward that kind of programming. It is already happening to a small degree but teacher education is overdue in involving itself to this end. I charge you, and I charge all of us in special education, to seize this opportunity.

THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATORS AND THE CONCEPT OF WORK

Harry S. Broudy
Professor Emeritus
University of Illinois

When I was invited to speak to you, I was reminded of a situation that occurred about ten years ago. You may recall that at that time there was a great deal of activity in education for what was then called the disadvantaged, and lots of money for conferences was available. I received a call from an institution in Ohio asking if I would deliver a talk at one of these conferences. So I said to the man: "This is a field in which there are many experts: sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists; and, of course, I'm not one of these. I have no expertise in this field at all." And he said, "You don't quite understand. We have plenty of people on the program who know what they're talking about, what we want you to do is to come down and be philosophical about it."

I'm glad there's still money left for the luxury of having someone on the program who can just talk to you about things, and who really doesn't have to contribute anything to what the members already know. But it's not a bad ritual, and when it goes with lunch, it doesn't hurt anything, really. There is a kind of harmless edification in listening to things that can be forgotten immediately thereafter.

I tried to read some of the materials that Rupert and some of his colleagues had written about the new problems confronting you; namely, the problem of vocational people having to teach handicapped children; people in special education confronted with the need of concern with or collaborating with people in vocational education; mainstreaming of handicapped children at the elementary level, and behind it all the national commitment to career education, which imposes another set of duties on the teaching profession. And as I read the materials, I realized more than ever that this is a field in which I have no competence whatever. I speak with the confidence of complete ignorance.

As I look at the new roles of these three groups, the special education people, the vocational education people (and those who teach them), and the people who have to do career education, it seems to me that three kinds of predicaments emerge. I call them predicaments, not problems, because for a predicament to become a problem requires that one be halfway home--that one already understands what the difficulty is and have some hypothesis about how to remove it. In many fields of education we haven't yet reached the problem stage. We're still in the predicament stage. We have feelings of discomfort, of stress and anxiety, but we really don't know what's causing them and not much more about what kind of effects they have.

The Three Predicaments

Three kinds of predicaments seem to suggest themselves.

Professional Guilds

First of all, is the predicament of two or more professional guilds trying to understand each other. Members of a guild have achieved specialization in a field of knowledge, and there is enough consensus within the guild so that they can talk to one another in a kind of technical shop talk. There's enough specialized expertise in the guild so that the outsider can't come in and participate easily. As a matter of fact, a really successful guild has enough esoteric expertise so that it makes the layman feel dependent on the guild. One of the great obstacles to the development of teaching professions is that almost every layman feels that with a little effort he or she could probably teach school, and probably do it as well as the professional. But special and vocational education do claim to have specialized expertise, rules for entry, a technical literature, conventions, organizations--all the characteristics of a guild. And for one guild to understand another is probably the most difficult assignment for the academic world. The more developed the guild, the less good are the chances for any other guild to understand it.

Furthermore, academic rewards for crossing guild lines are hard to find. The better the university, the worse are the chances for mounting interdisciplinary ventures. Interdisciplinary ventures are accelerated when somebody gets lots of money for an institute or project. Then one can hire people from the other guilds or borrow them. But when it comes to picking a professional convention to attend they go back to the original guild. The most significant item in the biography of an academic is the convention he cannot affort to miss.

The first predicament is that of two or more guilds, each proud of the expertise it has developed, finding a way of sharing it. This is true of the intercourse between any two disciplines, and any two guilds. One way of solving the problem is for the members of one discipline to master the other, which means getting another doctorate. Another way is to acquire the ability to understand and interpret the other guild's language and mode of inquiry without becoming a specialist. Understanding the general structure of the knowledge of a discipline, without knowing the details of its application might be called interpretive knowledge, rather than applicative knowledge that the guild member possess. Let me give you a trivial example of the difference. Long, long ago at MIT I studied the principles of combustion and thermodynamics. I could still (if you pushed me) explain the theory of the internal combustion engine. But when my car won't start in the morning, that isn't the knowledge I use. As a matter of fact, I don't even know where the carburetor is, although I know there must be one. I know what it does, but I don't know where it is. I understand it all right, but the knowledge I apply to solve the difficulty is my knowledge of the telephone directory. I call the service man, that's the way I solve that problem. I have interpretive knowledge about the internal combustion engine, but not applicative knowledge. I am suggesting, as far as the new teacher education is concerned, that these two sets of specialists will have to work together and think together. The alternative to limiting oneself to people who are at home in two or more disciplines as specialists is to promote interpretive understanding of the other discipline. This is quite a different task from getting specialized applicative knowledge of it.

Teaching Styles

The second kind of predicament is occasioned by a shift in teaching styles. The style of teaching that traditionally has worked very well in the standard vocational education program is what I call didactics. You know what you're going to teach; you know the skills that you're trying to develop; you have criteria for knowing when you have done it. The notion of performance-based objectives works very well in didactics. The more one knows about what one is going to do the more accurately one can predict, design and identify the outcome.

Vocational education, traditionally, has not had the usual scholastic problems of motivating the learner. This may have changed recently, but as I came through the system, the cure for the nonmotivated pupil was to send him into vocational education because there he could work with his hands; he'd know what he was doing; and he wouldn't be "turned off" by books. The literature that comes across my desk still prescribes vocational, hands-on experience with things as the cure for lack of motivation in academic studies and the consequent discipline problems.

On the other hand, very early in the game, teaching of the retarded, blind, deaf, and the handicapped was recognized as a field that required special knowledge and skills in dealing with atypical situations, with a heavy reliance on personality psychology. It was much more theoretically grounded than vocational education, just as the teaching in early childhood programs was theoretically oriented from the beginning. The style of teaching that has been favored in special education is what I would call "philetic." The term comes from the Greek, philos, love. Philetic teaching concentrates on a personal relationship between the teacher and the student. Philetic teaching involves rapport, self-image, identity, group therapy, and much more. Obviously, children who have handicaps, especially if they have emotional maladjustments, need that kind of approach. If you can't establish rapport what else can you do? So psychological understanding and rapport in teaching have always been a mark of the teacher in special education, and that is why the layman is terrified by the thought he might have to do it himself. That's why mainstreaming may terrify the classroom teacher; not that she can't do the didactics, but that she can't do the philetics. She may be wrong, but she's been told repeatedly that only specialists well grounded in philetics can teach "special" students.

There's another style of teaching, and this is probably used more in career education than in the other two fields. What specialized knowledge is used in career education? Well, really not that much. It's not esoteric; it isn't as highly specialized as vocational education, nor as psychologically-oriented as special education. We are trying to get the total school population interested in the world of work, the role of work, the variety of work. We don't do it didactically. We don't say, "Here is a list of occupations in the United States, memorize them." If I understand the spirit of career education, it seeks to discover the world of work, either by studying one's community, or through reading and discussion. It employs what I call heuristic teaching. It leads the pupil to learn by discovery, by discussion, and evaluation.

We have statistical evidence that these three styles of teaching are almost mutually exclusive. They require different outlooks and abilities. We find the same distinctions among pupils. There are pupils who are comfortable with the didactic teacher, some who are more comfortable with the heuristic one, and some with the philetic one. Very good professionals, and I use professional in the sense of a nonamateur, in this field should be able to do all three pretty well. But probably they'll be very good at only one of them.

The demands of these styles on the teacher are very different. One can turn out a good didactic teacher by taking any high school graduate and giving him or her solid training in materials and methods. As a matter of fact, we can do didactics better by sophisticated machines than with live teachers. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force have learned how to impart information and form skills very well. The average classroom teacher doing didactics operates like an inefficient teaching machine. Probably 80 percent of all teaching is didactic whether it's in graduate school or in first grade. Facts have to be learned and some by rote; some responses should be automatic. The silliest thing in the world is to try and reason one's way through the multiplication tables each time one has to multiply.

Heuristic teaching in mathematics as in any subject requires unusual mastery of the field, because one must be able to start anywhere in it and move in any direction--wherever questions and discussion may lead. This is not required of didactics.

The good philetic teacher is one who can establish rapport, especially with difficult children. Mr. Cosby on television portrays a philetic teacher. You know the children are having fun; they love jello; they're having a great time. What else Cosby is doing I don't know, but he's certainly doing philetics. The skills and knowledge required for that style of teaching are far closer to the preparation of a counselor or a group therapist than for a person who is trained to do didactics.

I recite these problems because when roles shift we are asking people to do things they didn't do before. We are not merely asking them to take on new content; we may also be asking them to acquire a new teaching style. If vocational teachers, for example, will be dealing with handicapped children they will need sophisticated philetics; acquiring the philetics will be much harder than acquiring new knowledge.

I have no solutions for this situation. Bringing the various guilds together is a necessary first step; osmosis will help. But if the trend toward new responsibilities continue, more attention will have to be paid in your curriculum planning to what I shall call contextual or interpretive knowledge of the subjects outside of one's specialty.

The Concept of Work

Let me come now to a suggestion for those who will do career education, vocational education of the handicapped, and the special education teachers who may become involved with vocational students. Work itself is a unifying concept. There already exists a rich literature on the subject. Much of this knowledge should not be considered as content to be taught to the pupil. It's what one teaches with, a perspective, or a context. May I suggest some of the topics that might constitute the foundational or context building studies of the world of work.

First of all, there could be a curriculum project for defining the role of work in each one of nine domains of value experience.

There is a domain of value we call economic. It covers the values of earning a living, obtaining material goods, distributing and enjoying them. There are intrinsic economic values although only misers enjoy having and handling money for its own sake. Yet it is perfectly conceivable that some people will work just to have money long after they have had more than they can spend. The extrinsic aspect of economic value is what the money can procure for its owner.

Health also has intrinsic and extrinsic value. Internally health means feeling good, alert, and strong. Anyone who doesn't know what it's like to feel good is unfortunate, and anyone who asks why it is good to feel good is odd, to say the least. There's an innate satisfaction in feeling good physically, but there's also instrumental value. Health is necessary for the realization of all other values.

I won't go through all the value domains. There are the civic values, the values of citizenship, community service; recreational value, the value of having fun; the values to be achieved in affectual association, family, friends, the intellectual values of truth and falsehood, knowledge; the aesthetic domain, dealing with the ugly and the beautiful; the religious domain, experience the holy or profane; there is the moral domain, the domain of making choices, of rationalizing, of giving reasons for choices, this is the field of duty, obligation, conscience, and so forth.

Each area of value is instrumental to all the others. Any one of these when made central constitutes a lifestyle. You know of people whose central domain is economic. There are some whose central domain is affectional, some whose central domain is intellectual. There are some people who have no unified style, they just jump from one to another. They do things as they come along. Their lives are disorganized. Some lives are highly structured.

I am suggesting that we can trace the role of work in each one of these domains; how it facilitates or inhibits realizing value in each of these areas. Some of this material is already familiar to you in the ever-growing literature on work. There are some for whom work is everything. As Rupert says, there are people like myself who are probably workaholics. But there are some for whom work is no more than a chore, a nuisance, a way of getting enough money to realize the other values. Between these two extreme roles of work in life there are innumerable combinations. Is it the case, as some allege, that in our culture most of us are condemned by the mass production system to work that is dull, routine, and peripheral to the other values? Or can our society so organize its economic system that for every individual who is willing to invest in training and education there is a rung on the economic ladder that not only fits but stretches his capacity?

The role of work is also changing as other social changes occur. The role of work for the elderly and the retired is up for serious debate; so is the role of work for the liberated woman. Will the labor force need youth, and what are we to do with them if they are not needed, say until the age of 20? These and many related problems should constitute the foundational course or courses for the cluster of curricula that have been discussed at this conference.

Although there is no one form of course that will work best in every situation, it is important that the course or courses have a clearly recognizable structure, for discussion in this field is especially vulnerable to bull sessions for credit. Two types of organization of the work can be suggested: one organizes the course by discussing the role of work in each of the value domains mentioned above. The other attacks the work role in terms of cultural contexts: the historical, psycho-social, ethical, sociological and political.

Either type of organization demands systematic selection of materials and allied activities, and the organizations concerned with vocational education or career education in any of its forms could do worse than devote some of their resources to such a curriculum development enterprise.

LEGISLATION AND THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

Reginald Petty, Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Washington, D.C.

Professional Involvement in Legislation

Probably one of the weakest groups in terms of political power in the last five years has been those people involved in vocational programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped. Although it doesn't necessarily have to be that way, unfortunately it continues to be that way. Seldom do I see those involved in programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped testifying for vocational education legislation.

In the current 1978 Vocational Education Act there are a number of areas that directly affect programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped. I would like to encourage you to get involved in the politics of how the money from this act will be spent on the state and local level. If you don't, you are going to be left with only a portion of the dollar that has been set aside for the disadvantaged and handicapped, and you are not going to have access to the larger sums.

The legislative process involves 1) legislation and 2) rules and regulations. Often these two do not necessarily have anything to do with one another. You may read legislation and then the rules and regulations and wonder how they are related. The Vocational Education Act will not take affect until 1978. You have this year to use as a planning year in order to decide what you want to do and what kind of things you want to push. Uniquely this year, the rules and regulations will not be completed until June, 1978. People within the Office of Education and three outside people who have been brought to the office to help in-house will give their interpretation of the act. This may not be your interpretation. Yet there will be hearings, coordinated by the regional offices, in every single state on the federal rules and regulations. I strongly suggest that you get in contact with the regional offices and your state representatives in order to get involved in the process of developing the rules and regulations. Don't stop there. Contact Washington, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, the National Advisory Council, and your State Advisory Council. The more contacts you make the better your chances are of influencing the development of the rules and regulations.

If you don't get involved in this process, you may not like some of the interpretations of the Vocational Education Act. To be very honest with you, the rules and regulations for the Act, to a great extent, are not being developed by people who have backgrounds related to the disadvantaged and handicapped. I'm not sure that there is anyone involved from the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education who has a background related to the handicapped. You have to make sure, therefore, that you present your input in representing the interests of the disadvantaged and handicapped.

Let me just walk quickly through the rules and regulations, simply pointing out those things which may have some direct impact upon you. I'm just going to highlight certain areas.

One of the first questions usually involves how much money we are talking about. Currently, the federal contribution for vocational education is about 500 million dollars per year. In 1978 the contribution will be 880 million; in 1979 it will be 1 billion, 30 million; in 1980 it will be 1 billion, 180 million; in 1981 it will be 1 billion, 325 million; and in 1982 it will be 1 billion, 485 million. Therefore, from now to 1982 the federal contribution for vocational education will increase 300 percent. Now, remember that the amounts we have been speaking about refer to "authorization" for federal contributions for vocational education. There is another process called "appropriation," which refers to the amount actually provided by Congress. The Education Subcommittees in Congress, as they write the legislation, include a dollar figure which they feel is needed to accomplish the task. The Appropriations Committee, however, usually allocates a lesser figure. In reality, I can promise that you will not receive anything near the amount "authorized" for federal contributions for vocational education. But, in 1978 the amount appropriated will be significantly more than 500 million.

A number of changes have been made through this legislation in terms of the disadvantaged and handicapped. The amount of federal contributions for vocational education set aside for the disadvantaged was increased from 15% to 20%. The amount set aside for the handicapped remains the same at 10%, but it must be matched by the state government. Although the initial intent of Congress in the 1968 VE Amendments was that the money have a catalytic effect, it is clearly not having that effect. With state matching, there is the potential of twice as many dollars than in previous years.

Block Grants

Another section of the Vocational Education Bill involves the revenue sharing mode. A compromise has been made in this bill which involves program consolidation in some areas. Many programs will be included under what used to be called the "block grant area," where most of the billion dollars will go. This money can be spent on the following programs: work study, co-op, energy education, instruction of area vocational schools, industrial arts, student placement services, residential vocational education schools, daycare, and stipends. For the first time, this money can be spent on stipends, which would have been illegal before this bill. Out of school youths and adults are also funded, which is quite different.

It is up to the state to determine how the money for this block grant will be divided. You must get involved in the political process at the state level if you feel money should be utilized in a certain program. For example, if you feel that students who have disadvantaged backgrounds or handicaps need stipends, you are going to have to work hard to be sure that a certain amount of the grant is spent in that way. It will not happen automatically. I assure you that most state directors would not agree that money should be used for stipends, daycare, or any kind of support service. Wording in the rules and regulations may also make it very difficult for money to be used for such a purpose. Thus, it is necessary for you to get involved in the political process.

Another block grant now includes the consolidation of all research categories. Research, exemplary programs, curriculum development, guidance and counseling, teacher training (formerly the EPDA) and a grant to help overcome sex bias are all included under this block grant consolidation. Once again, a block of money will be allotted for this block grant and the states will have to decide how to divide up the money. Those of you who are particularly concerned with improving teacher education or the area of special development will have a battle with the state directors about using the money for special development rather than the other above-mentioned areas. It will be a competitive toss-up, which is again another reason for getting involved in the political process.

The Commissioner's Discretionary Fund

Many people are getting their baseball bats together to deal with the USOE Commissioner on the topic of a 5% commissioner's discretionary fund, which will involve a lot of money. I suggest that some of you might want to join and begin to suggest to the commissioner how you may want to spend the 5% discretionary fund.

Local Advisory Councils

The new Act has mandated the establishment of local advisory councils, but they have not yet decided what they mean by local. It is unclear in the legislation whether local means school district or something else. Again, the rules and regulations will probably interpret what is meant by local council. The legislation does not state who appoints a local council. Therefore, unless it is stated in the rules and regulations who will be responsible for making the appointment, it will be a state or local decision. The legislation does, however, state that the state advisory council has to provide technical assistance to the local council. For the first time, the state advisory councils are being expanded to include representatives from the corrections area. The legislation still states that the council must include representatives for the handicapped or some disadvantaged, as does our national council.

A concern for coordination floats throughout the entire Vocational Education Act. It attempts to encourage coordination between vocational education, manpower, and special education areas. So I would again suggest that you get involved in that process.

Preparing Teachers for the Political Process

I taught a few seminars this summer with a total of about fifty students at both seminars. Out of that entire group, only five or six students had the faintest idea of how a bill is passed or the faintest idea about the politics of education. For example, I was talking for a day and a half about majority and minority members of Congress before I realized that the students thought that I was talking about blacks and whites. When I mentioned that there were two sides of the island, and the majority sits on one side and the minority on the other, someone finally said, "Gee, I didn't know they were discriminating to that extent in Congress." These Ph.D. students did not have a sense for what a bill was. I want to suggest to you who are involved in teacher education in the universities, that you see to it that your students have some sense of the political process. Increasingly, those who go into administrative areas are going to be called upon to become involved in the political process and you can help them by giving them some prime knowledge as to how the political system functions, before they leave the university.

RECENT LEGISLATION AND ISSUES AFFECTING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Bill Halloran
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
United States Office of Education

Introduction

These remarks will review the new provisions found in recently-enacted Federal legislation that will have an affect upon the vocational education of handicapped persons. To place these comments in an appropriate context for teacher education, let me review some of the current activities in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), U. S. Office of Education.

The Government Accounting Office (GAO) is the arm of the government that reviews programs, policies, and expenditures of federal funds and identifies problems in the delivery of the intent of programs to the people who need them. Recently, a GAO report directed to the Personnel Preparation Program within the BEH identified four major issues or problem areas in the delivery of personnel preparation services. Naturally, the reaction of the Brueau was initially defensive. The GAO identified the Bureau's failure in its responsibility to provide vocational educators with skills that deal effectively with handicapped children enrolled in regular vocational education programs. In its response to the report, however, the Bureau immediately concurred. The Bureau's response was expanded to state that the problem was two-fold. Neither are vocational educators being trained to deal with the handicapped in the integrated environment, nor are special educators being trained to deal with the development of career, prevocational and vocational skills of handicapped individuals. In many cases, special educators are expecting vocational educators to provide handicapped learners with vocational education without providing any preliminary career development or prevocational skills. In their response, BEH agreed to coordinate with the Bureau of Occupational Adult Education in developing a joint plan for implementing effective programs dealing with the preparation of vocational educators to deal with the handicapped. This task force is fairly unique in government. Strategies are now being developed by BEH to improve the delivery of personnel preparation services. A handbook was developed for the staff at BEH, and through staff inservice activities BEH personnel are learning important aspects of career and vocational education.

For the past 3-4 years the Division of Personnel Preparation (DPP) has supported teacher training programs, both preservice and inservice, to train professionals who can provide vocational and career education for the handicapped. In Fiscal Year 1976 (June 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977) grants totalling approximately $900,000 in this priority area were awarded. The initial projected budget for FY 1976 called for awarding

$1.4 million, but a sufficient number of quality applications were not received. The projected budget of FY 1977 (next year) in this priority area is $2.42 million, and I expect it will continue to be a major priority for several years to come. Teacher educators from the fields of vocational education, special education, and rehabilitation counseling must respond to the concerns of the GAO report and the incentives offered by the Division of Personnel Preparation's program.

LEGISLATION

Recently, four significant pieces of legislation were passed which deal with vocational education for the handicapped. I don't think that even the special education or vocational education people are fullay aware of their existence or what they mandate. These four pieces of legislation include Section 503 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 94-142--The Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, and the Education Amendments of 1976 --Title II of which is the Vocational Education Act.

SECTION 503: REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is an affirmative action statement for employment of the handicapped. It states that every employer doing business with the federal government under a contract of more than $2,500 must take affirmative action to hire handicapped individuals. It also states that all government contractors holding a contract or subcontract of $50,000 or more and having at least fifty employees are required to develop and maintain an affirmative action plan. The affirmative action plan must list recruiting sources, which would include public school programs that are training personnel to prepare handicapped individuals for the world of work.

Employers do not seem uptight about an affirmative action requirement. Yet when they are asked if they are making an affirmative action commitment to hire the handicapped their reaponse is usually, "We have no qualified individuals coming to seek employment." Our educational system is not training handicapped individuals with saleable skills which qualify them to enter the markets of these employers. Over 50% of the businesses in this country are under federal contract. Who are they in the communities? What are their employment needs? Can we work with employers in developing affirmative action policies; can we assist them in their recruiting; can we train individuals to become qualified to meet the employer's needs? The President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped has developed an "Affirmative Action Pocket Guide," written in lay terms, which describes the requirements of the affirmative action in Section 503. The guide is available through the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped or the regional offices in the Department of Labor.

SECTION 504: REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act states that any recipient of federal financial assistance may not discriminate on the basis of an individual's handicap. The preliminary regulations outline discriminatory practices such as 1) denying a qualified handicapped person the opportunity to participate in a service provided to others; and 2) providing the qualified handicapped person with a less effective program than is provided others. The regulations also delineate nondiscriminatory practices in employment, program assessibility, education, (preschool, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary), health, welfare, and social services.

PUBLIC LAW 94-142: THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT OF 1975

Essentially, Public Law 94-142 states that each handicapped child must be provided a "free and appropriate" public education. The word "appropriate" is fascinating. Are there any handicapped adolescents or adults who should not have access to vocational education; who do not have the right to an "appropriate" education? The notion is similar to the vocational legislation that states that vocational education is for all who can benefit. Are there any handicapped individuals who could not benefit from some form of vocational education?

One of the new elements of this Act is the requirement that each handicapped individual who is receiving special education must have an individualized education program, which contains broad goals and specific short term objectives. This plan must be updated at least yearly. We are trying to include a component of career, pre-vocational and vocational education in the regulation. But do special educators who will be training the handicapped, or training the teachers of the handicapped, obtain competencies in developing individualized educational plans? Is career or vocational education an important criteria in the planning? What prerequisites or entry level skills should be included in the planning in order to prepare students for vocational education programs?

The language of Public Law 94-142 also states that handicapped students should be educated with nonhandicapped students to the maximum extent appropriate--mainstreaming. Unfortunately, the interpretation of this language has built hostility in some arenas between vocational educators, educators of the handicapped, and others. The goal of educating all handicapped children with nonhandicapped children in the least restrictive environment is very good. On the other hand, is the least restrictive environment always the most responsive environment? Is it responsive to the individual's unique needs and goals?

Public Law 94-142 also requires that all federal programs, including vocational education, must meet state standards. In some cases, vocational educators have used their own criterion for labeling, identifying, assessing, and placing handicapped children. Their criterion was often inconsistent with the criterion used by other people in the state dealing with the education of the handicapped. Public Law 94-142 requires that all programs dealing with the handicapped must meet standards established by the educational agency within the state which is responsible for the administration of programs for the handicapped.

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1976

The Education Amendments of 1976, Title II of which is the Vocational Education Act, again reinforces the need for vocational education for the handicapped. It requires national, state, and now local advisory councils. Each advisory council at the federal and state level must have a member who is familiar with, or an advocate for handicapped individuals.

This new Vocational Education Act states very specifically that state plans and programs for the handicapped must be consistent with the state plan required in the Education of the Handicapped Act for educating all handicapped children. One piece of legislation, therefore, compliments the other. The state educational agency standards must be consistent with all of the requirements of the state plan section of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, PL 94-142.

The requirement to spend at least 10% of the state's federal vocational education funds for the handicapped is also continued. However, these funds must now be equally matched with state and local funds which are specifically earmarked for vocational education for handicapped learners. At the current levels, the states are receiving about $500 million in their basic grant. Ten percent of these funds with the matching requirement will make available at least $100 million for programs and services. Because states have previously been hesitant to spend their funds for vocational education for the handicapped, there should be significant improvements in the quantity and quality of programs.

Another important component of the new Vocational Education Act is the provision of emergency assistance for remodeling and renovating of vocational education facilities. In the first year, 25 million dollars is authorized; and in the next three years, up to 100 million dollars could be appropriated for the renovation of old urban and rural facilities. All renovations must comply with barrier-free design standards which are detailed in the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968. Therefore, in order for a local education agency to obtain funds to renovate facilities, the renovation must meet the barrier-free design standards. Some of our older vocational education facilities are monstrosities in terms of entry by handicapped individuals.

With these changes in the requirements for renovation and construction of facilities, it is imperative that the changes be reflected in the curricula of vocational architectural drafting courses. In this respect vocational educators have an obligation to teach their students about the needs of the handicapped, as well as to include the handicapped in their classes.

REGULATIONS

Within the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, where the regulations for PL 94-142 are being developed, staff advocates of vocational and career education have been providing input to each draft of the regulations. Communications will also be initiated with the team developing the regulations for the Vocational Education Act to insure that the requirements of PL 94-142 and PL 94-482 are consistent.

In the near future proposed regulations for both Acts will be published for public comment. It is super imperative that teacher educators, other professionals, and the professional organizations review and take a position on the proposed guidelines. If you have reviewed the legislation I'm sure you recognize there are significant issues, differences and gaps that will be addressed in the regulations. Some of the areas of concern you may want to consider are:

1) How will the "consistency" of State plans be evaluated?

2) Can set-aside funds be used for inservice training, curriculum development, or other supportive services?

3) How will the efforts of the State advisory council for vocational education and the State advisory panel for the handicapped be coordinated?

4) Will individual education plans be required for all handicapped students in vocational education?

5) Will the U. S. Office of Education have sufficient staff to administer the new provisions related to vocational education for the handicapped?

Again, I strongly urge you to obtain copies of the Federal Register when the proposed regulations are published and either provide testimony at hearings which will be held, or submit written comments and reactions. A united, network-based effort by the professional associations is also very effective. The newly-established National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel (NAVESNP - a section of the American Vocational Association), through its Legislative Committee, will likely be formulating a position for their association and sending appropriate newsletters to their membership. The participation of teacher educators in this effort will be critical.

SUMMARY

Understanding and shaping the regulations and legislation influencing vocational programs for the handicapped is vitally important for leadership personnel in State departments and universities and colleges. This legislation represents a new promise to the handicapped community. Once we affirm the extent and scope of the promise, all efforts will be shifted to delivering on the promise. The most important factor in fulfilling the promise will be the attitudes, skills, and knowledge of the professionals who must provide the appropriate programs and services. The challenge for you, as teacher trainers, is indeed significant and complex, but I'm sure you will agree that the legislative promises are valid and overdue.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

Betty Marion
Essex County Vocational Schools
New Jersey

With the newly enacted legislation and the mandates written into state and federal laws, someone must find a way to reach the 35 to 40 percent special needs student population that will be on the rolls in the local educational agencies in the next few years.

It's good to hear joint planning from the vocational educator and the special educator. But we should keep in mind that the target population for advanced or secondary certification, whichever you call it, should be open to all educational personnel. And that's quite the fact. Foundations or survey courses in secondary school programs for special needs should be required of all teachers in undergraduate work. The same is true of courses for the exceptional child, with emphasis for our purposes on secondary levels. Do not leave out the gifted. They are just as much an exception to the regular student norm as the trainable or the hard core disadvantaged, and I heard no one mention them in their discussion.

For vocational educators specializing in special needs students a dual certification can be introduced. We've heard that some places already have it. However, it has been our experience that this does not take hold that easily unless you have the capability of intensive field experience for the wide variety of learning environments or organizational models. The student just coming from college does not possess the ability to continue to emphasize what the Canadians call the instructional objectives core clusters. I'm referring to a beautifully designed program at the Canadian Training Research Division and their "Generic Skills Handbook of Occupational Information." For example, your academic emphasis must be on tightly structured computational and communications skills. No one can compete without this. And as much as you should include the basic skills inventory for all special needs students, you should also include a vocational skills inventory. The Canadians have done an outstanding job along these lines with occupational profiling. They also include interpersonal skills, attending behavior, reasoning and manipulative skills in their design. One of our biggest dilemmas is that the special needs certification programs are evolutionary in nature and rightly so. They have emerged because of the new concerns for special needs students and the personnel who handle them. But our course content must be systematic in design. The human mind is too precious a thing to waste on haphazard curricula. We already know what we have in the curriculum that must be taught. How it is to be taught is what makes special needs curricula different than special education or vocational education. It is methodology not curriculum. You must come to grips with the vocational training, the teacher and the setting that is being used to train entry level service personnel. Attention must be given to the accompanying frustrations of the vocational teacher whose job experience has taught him/her that there are very few jobs left in a technical society that do not call for a multiple directional sense in reasoning skills. The same frustrations are found in the special education teacher who is called upon to make students competitive using a norm that puts pressure on both the teacher and the student to show improvement almost on a day to day basis.

We are asking the employer to be compassionate. We are asking the employer to be understanding. But vocational teachers or trainers have earned the respect of the business community. Now we're in a new ball game. And the vocational educator doesn't want to be replaced as coach in the middle of the year. Right from the beginning, have your students assume a role they will feel comfortable with in playing the game of educational management and design. Have them assume this role in a variety of settings and be responsible for backing up the decisions with documentation and implementation. This will help them step into an educational environment that will take advantage of the best of two worlds the world of work and the world of education.

Where in your course outline will you allow for the correlation of occupational analysis and educational taxonomy? Skill development and test and measurement skills do not always transfer to task analysis and assessment. Take advantage of the vocational job sheets written for every vocational program since their inception. And in adapting the teaching methods for in class instruction utilize both methods. Remember many of your trainees will need support personnel. Be sure they know they are there to support the educational program as established. Program change, is an in-school committee function, not the function of a single teacher. And since needs assessment is high on your list for establishing your priorities why are you now expecting teachers to make assessments and evaluations? Personnel development is all part of our job, new certification areas must be opening up. One, recently mentioned by John O'Brien primarily, the vocational evaluator. It's a totally new area. Some of your best vocational evaluators are rehabilitation people, why not work harder to bring them into the high school setting? They will agree with you that jobs are more difficult than ever to find with the possible exception of the blind, deaf or orthopedically impaired. With trainables now becoming part of your enrollments statistics, sheltered workshops will be looking for clients. Don't give up easily on those facilities. Utilize them in your high school setting as work adjustment centers. They do an outstanding job and there will always be a need for a one to one teaching ratios.

It might sound like I've ignored a large part of what you did here these last 3 days. I haven't. Each of you is at a different stage in your development and all of you will have to go through similar steps or processes to arrive at the total program you envision for your target population.

Areas of concern that need to be re-emphasized are:

1. Don't limit that target population. Make courses undergraduate elective as well as graduate elective; establish leadership levels, and provide on-site inservice as well as on campus - preservice and inservice.

2. Establish a sequence of courses that will draw on existing courses and that will provide the interdisciplinary input. Create a liaison advisory committee with all personnel groups to be served. (LEA, SEA, H.Ed. Com. etc.)

3. Do not forget that the special educator is a master at tender loving care (TLC), the vocational educator on the world of work, and the vocational rehabilitator at job placement. You need all three. Use them as resource persons in class.

4. Take advantage of the special educator child study team or whatever group in your LEA is responsible for accepting referrals and making recommendations or modification or services needed for particular students. They should be your specialists in assessment.

5. And last, stay close to your classroom teachers. Have respect for their views and their trials and tribulations. We wouldn't be in business without them.

In closing, I would like to call your attention to some statisical references from the vocational education summary fiscal year '74. One million, six hundred and twelve thousand disadvantaged students were served in that year. Two hundred and thirty-four thousand handicapped students were served in giving them skills necessary to make them successful in vocational education. We know, of course, that the number is growing every day. To give you the latest update on personnel survey forms, I have provided for you, hopefully enough copies, of a personal survey sheet that was done by the National Association for Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel. The State Department of Idaho, Roger Sathre our president-elect from the National Association was responsible for this project. Hopefully, in a couple of years when the project is repeated, many of you sitting here today, will have your statistical data reflected in the updated version. Thank you.

C - Group Activities

Session III: Assessment Activity I - Identification of Issues of Import to the Design of Special Needs Personnel Preparation Programs

The primary purpose of Assessment Activity I was to provide a setting in which individual team members could identify, discuss and reflect upon a variety of key issues pertaining to the vocational programming of students with special needs. The issues and concerns expressed during the four presentations preceding this session were designed to serve as a prelude for this activity.

Members from each of the 15 workshop teams were divided into four activity groups. To the extent possible, the four groups had an equal proportion of special educators, vocational educators and state department personnel: The diversity within each group was intended to encourage the identification and discussion of common areas of concern across disciplines and across institutions.

Leadership for each group was provided by four group facilitators chosen from the January, 1976 workshop. A discussion matrix, which appears in Appendix G, served as a guide to focus on the relationships between the problem (or need) and the professional activities of various special needs personnel. As the discussion proceeded, four graduate students interested in vocational programming for special needs students recorded the consensus viewpoint for each discussion topic. Copies of these records were distributed to the workshop participants prior to Assessment Activity II.

Session V: Assessment Activity II - Strategies for Attacking the Issues

The purpose of this activity was to formulate and review strategies appropriate for addressing the major issues identified during Assessment Activity I.

The project staff and the group facilitators reviewed the four discussion matrices from Activity I to determine the most common issues discussed within the four groups. Six topics emerged and served as discussion points for Assessment Activity II. The workshop participants were divided into 6 task force groups, with each task force being responsible for a particular issue. The 6 topics were:

1. The use of community resources in the development and evaluation of vocational programming for and job placement of special needs students.

2. Administration and management of special needs vocational programs at the local education agency level.

3. University faculty inservice for attitude and competence development for the vocational programming of special needs students.

4. Teacher competencies in student identification and assessment and program development.

5. Inservice and preservice training in theoretical and practical components of curriculum design for special needs vocational programming.

6. Teacher competencies in individual education plans and staffing skills.

Group facilitators and recorders assisted the discussion groups and a second discussion matrix (Appendix H) was used for recording purposes. The results of each group activity were presented to the workshop participants following the conclusion of this session.

Session VI: Team Action Planning Session

Approximately six hours were devoted to the development of team action planning. This session followed the group discussions and program presentations, and provided time for each team to discuss, debate and brainstorm the future directions of their own teacher education program.

At the end of this session each team submitted a written plan of action which included: 1) a brief program needs assessment statement; 2) long and short term action plan objectives; 3) long and short term strategies for attaining the objectives; 4) the resources needed to implement the plan; and 5) the anticipated observable outcomes. Each team was asked to include within the resources section a budget for the expenditure of $400.00 of follow-up funding to be provided through the national workshop project.

The format outline for the institutional action plans is presented in Appendix I.

Optional Mini-Sessions

Four optional mini-sessions were conducted concurrently during the final hour of the scheduled action planning session. This scheduling provided individual participants with a choice between continued action planning or further exploration of areas not previously available during the workshop.

Topic selection for the optional sessions was accomplished several weeks prior to the workshop. Each team captain was asked to review the workshop agenda and to suggest additional topics which would aid in the development of their action plan. The project staff reviewed their suggestions and chose four topics on the basis of this information and the availability of well qualified presenters. The topics and presenters for the four optional mini-sessions were:

Topic	Presenter(s)
1. USOE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped: Proposal Writing and Funding	Martha Bokee and L. Allen Phelps
2. Marc Gold's "Try Another Way" film presentation and discussion	Kurt Braun University of Illinois
3. Development of a System for the Identification and Assessment of Special Needs Learners	Robert Tomlinson University of Illinois
4. Program Evaluation Strategies	Tim L. Wentling University of Minnesota

Session VII: Cross-Review of Team Action Plans

Following the planning activity each team submitted a copy of their action plan to the project staff. The plans were duplicated between sessions in preparation for the cross-review activity.

Each participant was given copies of two action plans for review, and asked to use a cross-review instrument to record her/his reactions (Appendix J). This procedure provided each team with eight or more individual reviews of their team action plan. In addition, each participant had the opportunity to read critically two action plans developed by teams other than his/her own.

Many of the workshop activities provided the participants with opportunities to meet and interact with fellow professionals. The cross review activity, however, was unique in that it provided direct professional feedback to the action planning teams.

Session VIII: The Most Innovative Aspect of Our Action and Workshop Summary

During the concluding session of the workshop each team captain was asked to report the most innovative component of his/her team plan to the total group. Each presenter had three minutes to present this information. This activity was followed by observations of the workshop proceedings by Betty Marion and Rupert Evans.

SECTION III - EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP

EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP

Introduction

The workshop evaluation form was designed by Elizabeth Abbas and Shirley Rauh in cooperation with project staff.* The evaluation instrument appears in Appendix K. In addition to several background questions which assisted in the analysis of the evaluation, forty-eight items were used to evaluate nearly every aspect of the 2 1/2 day workshop. At the conclusion of the workshop each participant was asked to respond to the workshop evaluation instrument. The discussion of those responses follows.

Group Activities

The five group activities (issue identification, strategy identification task force, task force reports, team planning, and cross-review) were designed to complement each other and to aid team members in the development of their action plans. Seventeen evaluative items were devoted in these group activities. The data for these items appear in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

Seventy-six percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the time set aside for the teams to concentrate on the development of their action plans (team planning activity) was one of the most important contributions of the workshop (Table 3). Of the four group activities designed to supplement the development of team action plans the Cross Review Session received the highest marks. Sixty-eight percent stated that the Cross Review Session had some or much effect on planning (Table 4). The Issue Identification small group activity and the Strategy Identification Task Force activity received 61% and 63% positive responses respectively (Table 4). Only 52% of the respondents felt that the Task Force Report activity had much or some impact on team action plans while 41% felt that the Task Force Report activity had little or no impact on their action plan (Table 4). More detailed data appear in Table 5.

The majority of the respondents agreed that all four supplemental team planning activities (Sessions II, V, VI and VII) complemented other activities and should be included in future workshops of this type (Table 5).

---

*The project staff is indebted to Ms. Abbas and Ms. Rauh for their role in the development of the instrument and subsequent data analysis. Much of the following discussion would not have been possible without their assistance and comments.

TABLE 3

PARTICIPANT ATTITUDES TOWARD GROUP ACTIVITIES AT THE WORKSHOP

ACTIVITY	EVALUATIVE STATEMENT	ATTITUDE*					
		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
Sessions III and V Issue identification Small groups and Strategy Identification Task Forces	Significant issues and strategies for developing teacher education programs were discussed in the small group sessions	18	57	5	14	0	5
Session V Strategy Identification Task Forces	The issues discussed in task force groups strengthened the framework on on which we built our action plan	18	23	16	29	4	7
Team Action, Planning activity	One of the most important contributions the workshop made was giving us a chance to spend concentrated time on planning our program	32	44	5	16	0	3
Session VII Cross-review activity	The cross review session will be useful in preparing our revised action plan	16	49	10	10	7	5

* SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; NR = No Response.

TABLE 4

ACTIVITIES - EFFECT ON PLANNING

Group Activity	Much	Some	Little	None	No Response
Session III Issue Identification Small Group	21%	40%	29%	3%	5%
Session V Strategy Identification Task Forces	25	38	27	1	7
Session VI Task Force Reports	20	32	40	1	5
Session VII Cross Review	32	36	21	3	5

TABLE 5

GROUP ACTIVITIES

GROUP ACTIVITY / QUESTION	Session III Issue Identification Small Groups			Session V Strategy Identification Task Forces			Session VI Task Force Reports			Session VII Cross Review		
	% Yes	% No	% No Response	% Yes	% No	% No Resp.	% Yes	% No	% No Resp.	% Yes	% No	% No Resp.
Did this activity directly relate to your action planning?	69	28	6	65	23	10	51	41	4	63	26	10
Did this activity complement other topics discussed during this workshop?	84	6	8	78	8	13	63	26	10	80	6	13
Was this activity one that you would include in a future workshop of this emphasis?	69	17	10	69	15	15	60	28	10	69	13	15

Presentations

The purpose of formal presentations, like those of the group activities, was to facilitate the team action planning effort. As mentioned earlier, the presentations and group activities were scheduled so as to have the maximum effect on action planning. Each presentation was evaluated on the extent to which the participants felt that it positively affected their planning effort (Table 6). With the exception of the presentation on legislation and funding, which came at the end of a rather long and difficult day, all of the presentations were viewed as having some or much effect on planning by seventy percent or more of the participants.

When asked if the presentations related directly to their action plan all presentations did about equally well (Table 7). In addition, most participants agreed that all of the presentations related well to other workshop topics and that they would include such presentations in future workshops of this emphasis.

Optional Mini Sessions

During the last hour of Session VI, which was devoted to team development of action plans, the participants were given the opportunity to attend one or more of four optional mini-sessions. The sessions included: 1) "Try Another Way"--Marc Gold's introductory training film, 2) BEH--questions and answers on proposal writing and funding, 3) Assessment Project--a University of Illinois project currently in operation and 4) Planning and Evaluation Systems--Tim Wentling, Assistant Professor at the University of Minnesota. Of the 56 responding participants, 38 percent reported attending at least one of the mini-sessions and several attended two or more. The Marc Gold film received the greatest attendance (22 participants) and was considered a beneficial session by all who attended. Several of the 18 participants who did not attend a mini-session commented that they would have liked to attend one or more sessions, but needed this time to work on their team action plan.

Resource Materials Display[1]

Fifty two respondents reported reviewing the resource materials which were displayed in the main meeting room. Most of these people reported that they planned to order one or more of the materials whether for their personal library or department use. Only four participants did not review the materials, but two of these people indicated plans to order materials from the bibliography, which was provided to all participants.

---

[1] A national search for resource materials pertinent to the preparation of vocational and special education personnel was conducted prior to the workshop. A list of the materials displayed appear in Appendix L.

TABLE 6

EFFECT ON PLANNING - PRESENTATIONS

Presentation	Much	Some	Little	None	No Response
Session I Local Agency Perspective	29%	43%	16%	1%	9%
Session I Vocational Education Perspective	29	43	14	1	10
Session I Special Education Perspective	36	41	12	0	9
Session II Concept of Work	40	30	21	0	7
Session IV Funding and Legislation	23	30	34	5	7

TABLE 7

PRESENTATIONS

ACTIVITY / QUESTION	Session I LEA Perspective Vo Tech Perspective Sp Ed Perspective			Session II Concept of Work			Session IV Update: Legislation and Funding		
	% Yes	% No	% No Response	% Yes	% No	% No Resp.	% Yes	% No	% No Resp.
Did this presentation directly relate to your action plan?	67	28	4	54	41	4	58	32	8
Did this presentation compliment other topics discussed during the workshop?	89	4	6	86	8	4	76	6	17
Was this presentation one you would include in future workshops of this emphasis?	85	9	6	80	15	4	71	13	15

The Workshop as a Whole

The general objective of the workshop was to assist each participating team to prepare an "action plan" which could be used at their respective institution(s) to refocus or expand the preparation programs for vocational personnel for special needs students. Seventy-five percent of the participants stated that the workshop program accomplished this objective very well or extremely well. Twenty-one percent felt that this objective was somewhat accomplished and only 4% felt that the objective was not at all met.

Sixty-nine percent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that meeting with individuals from other universities contributed significantly to their action plan. Seventy-one percent agreed or strongly agreed that the design of the workshop encouraged the discussion of important issues. Nearly every respondent (85%) stated that they had personally made a contribution to the workshop. However, only 37% agreed or strongly agreed that they "would not have developed this type of teacher education plan if (they) had not participated" in the workshop indicating that several participants felt that they had refocused their plan in some manner.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The strengths and weaknesses of the workshop were reported by the participants with the use of open ended questions. The results of these questions are reported in Table 8. Generally, more strengths than weaknesses were reported by the participants and several respondents reported no weaknesses. The "crossbreeding" of ideas was the strength most often mentioned (30 responses). The second most often mentioned strength of the workshop was the opportunity to meet different people from across the country (18 responses).

The most often mentioned weakness was that the workshop was too structured (26 responses). Closely related to this comment was the complaint of too little free time (5 responses).

Conclusions

It seems clear that the participants were quite pleased with the planning and execution of the workshop. This was reflected in their response to the final question: "If a workshop such as this is held again, will you recommend to your colleagues at other universities that they participate?" Of the 56 respondents 84 percent answered yes, and 11 percent responded uncertain. None of the participants responded no. Many of those responding yes added comments such as "definitely," "of course," and "without a doubt."

As reflected in the responses to the final question, most participants felt that the workshop had been successful and of value to them in both their personal and professional growth. Comments made during the workshop were very positive and suggested that the participants felt that they were an important part of the proceedings (and they were!).

Most likely the action orientation of the sessions and the small group approach were the chief factors which contributed to positive feelings. The participants were rightfully treated as experts in their field who had much to offer each other. They were involved and working most of the two and one-half days of the workshop. A large [illegible] of their time was spent in small group sessions where their input was needed.

However, this emphasis on activity contributed to the major criticism of the workshop; that is, that the programming was too structured and intense. Evidently, this created pressure and frustration for many of the participants.

TABLE 8

WORKSHOP STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
MOST OFTEN MENTIONED BY 56 PARTICIPANTS

Strengths	Number of Responses
"Crossbreeding" of ideas	30
Meeting different people	18
Scheduling and design (on time, well planned, small group approach)	11
Action plan development	8
Getting vocational and special educators together	7
Other	14

Weaknesses	
Too structured	26
Too little free time	5
Lack of sharing of on-going successful programs	5
Few LEA representatives	3
Too little planning time	3
Other	11

SECTION IV - POST-WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with an account of some of the major activities conducted following the October 26-28, 1976 national workshop. This section will be divided into two parts: 1) post-workshop activities conducted by the project staff, and 2) post-workshop activities conducted or planned by the fifteen university/ consortium teams.

Post-Workshop Project Activities

Short term workshops tend to generate considerable dialogue and participant enthusiasm, but seldom are there provisions to support further development and implementation of these ideas following the workshop experience. The current project attempted to reduce this shortcoming by focusing a considerable amount of effort on post-workshop follow-up activities. In addition to the many telephone contacts with most teams, six major activities were conducted: 1) follow-up team funding; 2) distribution of an inservice resource guide; 3) dissemination of a bimonthly project newsletter; 4) development and distribution of a teacher education resource guide; and 5) development and distribution of the final project report.

Follow-up Team Funding

While at the workshop, each team developed an initial draft of their team action plan, followed by peer critique. Each team was instructed to take this information home with them, review their plan and submit their final version to the project staff approximately one month (Dec. 1, 1976) following the workshop. A section within the action plan asked the team members to delineate how they planned to utilize the follow-up funds provided through the project. A total of $400.00 was set aside for each university.

Once all action plans were received, a project staff member contacted each team captain for negotiation of the follow-up funding arrangements. A purchase requisition was then processed through the University of Illinois to purchase the materials and services essential to conducting the follow-up activities from each university. Payment to each team was processed following the receipt of a complete invoice and the follow-up team questionnaire. Unfortunately, due to institutional constraints and the red tape associated with accepting small grants, three of the teams were unable to accept follow-up funds.

Inservice Resource Guide

In December, 1976 each workshop team received a copy of the inservice guide, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners." This guide contains a series of seven instructional modules to be used for the preservice or inservice development of personnel who work with special needs learners. The guide was organized during the 1975-76 academic year and was extensively field-tested by special, vocational and counselor education personnel. Dr. L. Allen Phelps, who had served as project coordinator for the January 13-15, 1976 national teacher education workshop, developed this guide. Participants of the January workshop also received a copy of the resource guide.

The Project Newsletter

A bi-monthly newsletter, "The Sequel," was initiated to serve as a communication source among participants of the January and October workshops. The purpose of this newsletter was to encourage cooperative professional exchange by presenting an update on activities, issues and developments in special needs teacher education. Several workshop participants contributed articles and suggestions for this newsletter. The first edition of the newsletter was published in December, 1976. Two more editions were published, one in February and one in April, 1977. Copies of each were sent to January and October, 1976 workshop participants and other professionals who asked to be included on the mailing list. Over 225 copies of each edition were distributed. All three editions of "The Sequel" were submitted to ERIC.

The Teacher Education Resource Guide

A major outcome of this project was the development of a resource guide for teacher educators in special and vocational education. This guide, edited by Len Albright and Gary M. Clark, is basically a compilation of many of the activities conducted and products developed during the two national workshop projects. Sections on the state of the art, guidelines and strategies for personnel preparation, examples of university based and local education agency programs, action planning strategies, instructional resources and available federal funding sources for special needs personnel preparation are presented.

Five hundred copies of this guide were printed and sent to all workshop participants, steering committee members and individuals from non-selected institutions during June 1977.

The resource guide will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. The guide was also submitted to ERIC.

Final Project Report

The final project report is a presentation of pre-workshop, workshop and post-workshop project activities. This report is being distributed to all workshop participants, to steering committee members and to institutions which applied for workshop participation but could not be accomodated. Copies of this document will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. This final report will also be submitted to ERIC during August, 1977.

Post-Workshop Team Activities

In May, 1977 a team progress questionnaire was sent to each of the 15 workshop teams (Appendix M). Each team was asked to provide a reporting of team developments since the October workshop. The reader interested in up-to-date descriptions of the programs of many of the teams represented in both January and October, 1976 workshops is referred to Albright, Len and Clark, Gary M. (ed), Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide, July, 1977. Unlike the above mentioned resource guide, this part will not describe each program separately. Instead, what follows is a collective summary of the activities conducted and/or planned by the workshop teams since October, 1976.

Course/Program Development

In preparation for course/program development six teams have completed some sort of teacher competency identification. With one exception, remaining teams report competency identification as a future activity. Eight teams have planned or implemented steering committee activities for program development since the October workshop. Two teams had steering committees prior to the workshop.

While nine of the 15 institutions report introductory courses in special needs vocational education only three institutions report offering a methods course.

Two teams had undergraduate programs prior to the workshop, and only two additional teams are currently exploring the possibility of offering undergraduate programs. A similar situation exists at the graduate level. Two teams report that their institutions offer graduate degree programs and four teams report graduate programs in the planning stages.

Inservice Resource Guide

In December, 1976 each workshop team received a copy of the inservice guide, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners." This guide contains a series of seven instructional modules to be used for the preservice or inservice development of personnel who work with special needs learners. The guide was organized during the 1975-76 academic year and was extensively field-tested by special, vocational and counselor education personnel. Dr. L. Allen Phelps, who had served as project coordinator for the January 13-15, 1976 national teacher education workshop, developed this guide. Participants of the January workshop also received a copy of the resource guide.

The Project Newsletter

A bi-monthly newsletter, "The Sequel," was initiated to serve as a communication source among participants of the January and October workshops. The purpose of this newsletter was to encourage cooperative professional exchange by presenting an update on activities, issues and developments in special needs teacher education. Several workshop participants contributed articles and suggestions for this newsletter. The first edition of the newsletter was published in December, 1976. Two more editions were published, one in February and one in April, 1977. Copies of each were sent to January and October, 1976 workshop participants and other professionals who asked to be included on the mailing list. Over 225 copies of each edition were distributed. All three editions of "The Sequel" were submitted to ERIC.

The Teacher Education Resource Guide

A major outcome of this project was the development of a resource guide for teacher educators in special and vocational education. This guide, edited by Len Albright and Gary M. Clark, is basically a compilation of many of the activities conducted and products developed during the two national workshop projects. Sections on the state of the art, guidelines and strategies for personnel preparation, examples of university based and local education agency programs, action planning strategies, instructional resources and available federal funding sources for special needs personnel preparation are presented.

Five hundred copies of this guide were printed and sent to all workshop participants, steering committee members and individuals from nonselected institutions during June 1977.

The resource guide will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. The guide was also submitted to ERIC.

Final Project Report

The final project report is a presentation of pre-workshop, workshop and post-workshop project activities. This report is being distributed to all workshop participants, to steering committee members and to institutions which applied for workshop participation but could not be accomodated. Copies of this document will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. This final report will also be submitted to ERIC during August, 1977.

Post-Workshop Team Activities

In May, 1977 a team progress questionnaire was sent to each of the 15 workshop teams (Appendix M). Each team was asked to provide a reporting of team developments since the October workshop. The reader interested in up-to-date descriptions of the programs of many of the teams represented in both January and October, 1976 workshops is referred to Albright, Len and Clark, Gary M. (ed), Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide, July, 1977. Unlike the above mentioned resource guide, this part will not describe each program separately. Instead, what follows is a collective summary of the activities conducted and/or planned by the workshop teams since October, 1976.

Course/Program Development

In preparation for course/program development six teams have completed some sort of teacher competency identification. With one exception, remaining teams report competency identification as a future activity. Eight teams have planned or implemented steering committee activities for program development since the October workshop. Two teams had steering committees prior to the workshop.

While nine of the 15 institutions report introductory courses in special needs vocational education only three institutions report offering a methods course.

Two teams had undergraduate programs prior to the workshop, and only two additional teams are currently exploring the possibility of offering undergraduate programs. A similar situation exists at the graduate level. Two teams report that their institutions offer graduate degree programs and four teams report graduate programs in the planning stages.

Inservice Resource Guide

In December, 1976 each workshop team received a copy of the inservice guide, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners." This guide contains a series of seven instructional modules to be used for the preservice or inservice development of personnel who work with special needs learners. The guide was organized during the 1975-76 academic year and was extensively field-tested by special, vocational and counselor education personnel. Dr. L. Allen Phelps, who had served as project coordinator for the January 13-15, 1976 national teacher education workshop, developed this guide. Participants of the January workshop also received a copy of the resource guide.

The Project Newsletter

A bi-monthly newsletter, "The Sequel," was initiated to serve as a communication source among participants of the January and October workshops. The purpose of this newsletter was to encourage cooperative professional exchange by presenting an update on activities, issues and developments in special needs teacher education. Several workshop participants contributed articles and suggestions for this newsletter. The first edition of the newsletter was published in December, 1976. Two more editions were published, one in February and one in April, 1977. Copies of each were sent to January and October, 1976 workshop participants and other professionals who asked to be included on the mailing list. Over 225 copies of each edition were distributed. All three editions of "The Sequel" were submitted to ERIC.

The Teacher Education Resource Guide

A major outcome of this project was the development of a resource guide for teacher educators in special and vocational education. This guide, edited by Len Albright and Gary M. Clark, is basically a compilation of many of the activities conducted and products developed during the two national workshop projects. Sections on the state of the art, guidelines and strategies for personnel preparation, examples of university based and local education agency programs, action planning strategies, instructional resources and available federal funding sources for special needs personnel preparation are presented.

Five hundred copies of this guide were printed and sent to all workshop participants, steering committee members and individuals from nonselected institutions during June 1977.

The resource guide will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. The guide was also submitted to ERIC.

Final Project Report

The final project report is a presentation of pre-workshop, workshop and post-workshop project activities. This report is being distributed to all workshop participants, to steering committee members and to institutions which applied for workshop participation but could not be accomodated. Copies of this document will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. This final report will also be submitted to ERIC during August, 1977.

Post-Workshop Team Activities

In May, 1977 a team progress questionnaire was sent to each of the 15 workshop teams (Appendix M). Each team was asked to provide a reporting of team developments since the October workshop. The reader interested in up-to-date descriptions of the programs of many of the teams represented in both January and October, 1976 workshops is referred to Albright, Len and Clark, Gary M. (ed), Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide, July, 1977. Unlike the above mentioned resource guide, this part will not describe each program separately. Instead, what follows is a collective summary of the activities conducted and/or planned by the workshop teams since October, 1976.

Course/Program Development

In preparation for course/program development six teams have completed some sort of teacher competency identification. With one exception, remaining teams report competency identification as a future activity. Eight teams have planned or implemented steering committee activities for program development since the October workshop. Two teams had steering committees prior to the workshop.

While nine of the 15 institutions report introductory courses in special needs vocational education only three institutions report offering a methods course.

Two teams had undergraduate programs prior to the workshop, and only two additional teams are currently exploring the possibility of offering undergraduate programs. A similar situation exists at the graduate level. Two teams report that their institutions offer graduate degree programs and four teams report graduate programs in the planning stages.

Inservice Resource Guide

In December, 1976 each workshop team received a copy of the inservice guide, "Instructional Development for Special Needs Learners." This guide contains a series of seven instructional modules to be used for the preservice or inservice development of personnel who work with special needs learners. The guide was organized during the 1975-76 academic year and was extensively field-tested by special, vocational and counselor education personnel. Dr. L. Allen Phelps, who had served as project coordinator for the January 13-15, 1976 national teacher education workshop, developed this guide. Participants of the January workshop also received a copy of the resource guide.

The Project Newsletter

A bi-monthly newsletter, "The Sequel," was initiated to serve as a communication source among participants of the January and October workshops. The purpose of this newsletter was to encourage cooperative professional exchange by presenting an update on activities, issues and developments in special needs teacher education. Several workshop participants contributed articles and suggestions for this newsletter. The first edition of the newsletter was published in December, 1976. Two more editions were published, one in February and one in April, 1977. Copies of each were sent to January and October, 1976 workshop participants and other professionals who asked to be included on the mailing list. Over 225 copies of each edition were distributed. All three editions of "The Sequel" were submitted to ERIC

The Teacher Education Resource Guide

A major outcome of this project was the development of a resource guide for teacher educators in special and vocational education. This guide, edited by Len Albright and Gary M. Clark, is basically a compilation of many of the activities conducted and products developed during the two national workshop projects. Sections on the state of the art, guidelines and strategies for personnel preparation, examples of university based and local education agency programs, action planning strategies, instructional resources and available federal funding sources for special needs personnel preparation are presented.

Five hundred copies of this guide were printed and sent to all workshop participants, steering committee members and individuals from nonselected institutions during June 1977.

The resource guide will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. The guide was also submitted to ERIC.

77

Final Project Report

The final project report is a presentation of pre-workshop, workshop and post-workshop project activities. This report is being distributed to all workshop participants, to steering committee members and to institutions which applied for workshop participation but could not be accomodated. Copies of this document will be available, as the supply lasts, from Dr. Rupert N. Evans, 188 Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. This final report will also be submitted to ERIC during August, 1977.

Post-Workshop Team Activities

In May, 1977 a team progress questionnaire was sent to each of the 15 workshop teams (Appendix M). Each team was asked to provide a reporting of team developments since the October workshop. The reader interested in up-to-date descriptions of the programs of many of the teams represented in both January and October, 1976 workshops is referred to Albright, Len and Clark, Gary M. (ed), *Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide*, July, 1977. Unlike the above mentioned resource guide, this part will not describe each program separately. Instead, what follows is a collective summary of the activities conducted and/or planned by the workshop teams since October, 1976.

Course/Program Development

In preparation for course/program development six teams have completed some sort of teacher competency identification. With one exception, remaining teams report competency identification as a future activity. Eight teams have planned or implemented steering committee activities for program development since the October workshop. Two teams had steering committees prior to the workshop.

While nine of the 15 institutions report introductory courses in special needs vocational education only three institutions report offering a methods course.

Two teams had undergraduate programs prior to the workshop, and only two additional teams are currently exploring the possibility of offering undergraduate programs. A similar situation exists at the graduate level. Two teams report that their institutions offer graduate degree programs and four teams report graduate programs in the planning stages.

University Staff Development

A third of the teams have evaluated present faculty competencies and five teams plan to conduct such evaluations at a future date. Three teams have written job descriptions and have created search committees. The remaining teams do not report planning search committee activities.

Exploration of Funding Sources

Ten teams reported completion of searches for local or university monies. Two additional teams are planning such exploration. Nine teams have explored state funding sources and three teams have looked to federal governmental agencies for funding assistance. Plans for the use of funds include state or local inservice workshops, curriculum development and research.

Communication/Cooperation

Over half of the reporting institutions have held joint departmental/university meetings to facilitate planning and on-going program development. The remaining teams reported plans for such meetings in the future. The existance of joint departmental committees was reported by five teams and six teams reported other activities which were directed at increasing interdepartmental communication.

Inservice Teacher Education

Inservice workshops represent the single most frequently reported strategy for meeting inservice teacher needs. Five teams reported that they had conducted inservice workshops prior to the national workshop. Since that time, six additional teams have written and submitted inservice workshop proposals. At the time of writing, the project staff was aware of two teams which received funding and conducted their workshops during June, 1977.

Summary

Most or all of the team action plan short term objectives were reported as completed or progressing at a satisfactory rate. In addition, approximately two thirds of the teams included comments indicating continued team enthusiasm for team activities, e.g., "team has sense of accomplishment," and "Everyone is very happy to be involved."

Some of the more frequently encountered problems included difficulty in obtaining funds, problems in team members finding ample time to work on team activities, and certification problems. One very active team expressed serious doubt about continued success, though their present level of progress seemed to be good. Another team reported a complete cessation of activity due to internal problems within the College of Education and the two involved departments. Yet another team has failed to return their final team progress report and the project staff have not been able to ascertain the exact nature of the difficulty.

Despite the limitations inherent in any short term evaluation, the evidence suggest that many vocational and special teacher educators recognize the need for, are committed to, and are putting into operation the team approach to the preparation of vocational special needs personnel. The national workshop appears to have served a catalytic role in fostering these developments.

APPENDIX A

STEERING COMMITTEE ROSTER

STEERING COMMITTEE ROSTER

Mr. Wayne Booten	Director, Calhoun Area Vocational Center Battle Creek, Michigan
Dr. Gary Clark	Special Education Department University of Kansas
Ms. Charlotte Conoway	NAVESNP President-elect Baltimore, Maryland
Dr. Bruno D'Alonzo	Special Education Department Arizona State University
Mr. James Haire	Division of Adult, Vocational & Technical Education Illinois Office of Education
Dr. William Halloran	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped U.S. Office of Education
Dr. Andrew Halpern	Special Education Department University of Oregon
Mr. Charles Jaymes	Region V Office U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare
Dr. M. Stephen Lilly	Department Chairman Special Education Department University of Illinois
Ms. Betty Marion	Director, Essex County Vocational Schools Newark, New Jersey
Mr. Gregory Patton	Department of Vocational Education University of Pittsburgh
Dr. Lloyd Phipps	Department Chairman Vocational & Technical Education University of Illinois
Ms. Glee Saunders	Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education U.S. Office of Education

APPENDIX B

AGENDA - STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

JULY 27, 1976

AGENDA

National Steering Committee
Special Needs Teacher Education Workshop
University of Illinois
July 27, 1976

9:00	Welcome and Introductions	Dr. Rupert N. Evans Professor of Vocational and Technical Education and EPDA Project Director
9:15	Project Overview	Len Albright EPDA Project Coordinator
9:45	Selection of Institutional Teams Criteria and Process	Rupert N. Evans
10:30	Workshop Format and Agenda	Len Albright and Kurt Braun - Project Assistant
	Suggestions for Resource Personnel	Rupert N. Evans
11:45	Lunch	
1:30	Review of Proposed Instruments and Procedures for Description of Institutional Action Plans	Len Albright
2:30	Suggestions for Improvement of Proposed Staff Follow-up Activities	Len Albright and Kurt Braun
4:00	Adjournment	

APPENDIX C

• WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENT LETTER

August 6, 1976

Dear Colleague:

The University of Illinois is currently preparing for a second national teacher education workshop on the preparation of personnel to serve persons with special needs in vocational settings. The workshop will be held at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, in October 26-28, 1976.

The need for preparing and developing personnel to better serve the adolescent/adult special needs learner is well established and was indicated by the institutional response to the January, 1976 National Workshop on Vocational Education for Special Needs Students. Many universities are interested in designing personnel programs to meet this need. The express purpose of this second workshop and the post-workshop follow-up activities is to assist an additional fifteen (15) selected universities or consortia in refocusing and/or expanding personnel training programs in this field.

By means of this letter, we are soliciting brief proposals from teacher training institutions in all parts of the nation who are interested in having teams of vocational and special education teacher educators participate in this national workshop. The enclosed materials (Guidelines for Developing the Mini-Proposal and Mini-Proposal form) describe the information which interested institutions are to submit. In order to expedite pre-workshop planning, the mini-proposals must be mailed (postmarked) to the project director not later than September 8, 1976.

The project grant will pay for the lodging expenses, 2 luncheons and 1 banquet dinner for one half of each four member institutional team. Travel costs and the remaining meal and lodging costs will be the responsibility of each attending team.

While at the workshop, the participant will be exposed to a variety of models and resources for preparing personnel to meet the vocational needs of special needs learners. In addition, ample time will be provided for team work sessions to develop and solidify institutional action plans. The action plans will identify the objectives and activities which the team plans to initiate within their respective institution/state to expand personnel programs addressing the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged persons enrolled in vocational programs. The project staff anticipates being able to make available approximately $400 per institution or consortium to assist each team in implementing its "action plan."

Those institutions selected for workshop participation will be expected to: (1) send an enthusiastic team of vocational and special teacher educators (possibly including department chairpersons or deans), (2) encourage their representatives to participate fully and actively in the entire 2 1/2 days of workshop activities, and (3) support the planning efforts of the attending team in a reasonable manner.

In addition to the institutional team members selected, state office of education personnel will be invited to attend the workshop. After the fifteen institutions have been selected, the EPDA coordinator in each of the respective state offices of vocational education will be asked to nominate a state office representative to attend the workshop, and assist the university team in development of its action plan.

This project is designed specifically to further expand and improve the nation's efforts in the training of teachers and other personnel to more adequately meet the vocational needs of special learners. Our basic motion is that this can be done most effectively through cooperative endeavors between the fields of vocational and special education. We are looking forward with great anticipation to an extremely important national teacher education workshop. We invite you to join us in this exciting project, and are looking forward to receiving your mini-proposal.

Sincerely,

Rupert N Evans

Rupert N. Evans
Project Director

RNE/GMC:sl

Enclosures

APPENDIX D

MINI-PROPOSAL APPLICATION FORM

MINI-PROPOSAL

for participation in the

NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON SPECIAL NEEDS VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION

October 26-28, 1976
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

SUBMITTING INSTITUTION(S):

Proposal Initiator(s):

Name:			
Title:			
Address:			
Telephone:			

Descriptive Title of the Planned or Existing
Program for Preparing Special Needs Personnel:

Administrative Endorsement(s):
(Signatures of Dean(s) and/or Department Chairperson(s))

Title:	Title:
Date:	Date:
Title:	Title:
Date:	Date:

MINI-PROPOSAL

I. Current Program Status: Please describe your present program for preparing and/or upgrading personnel to serve special needs students in vocational settings. Include a description of program design, objectives and unique features.

II. Proposed Program Directions: Please describe your needs assessment activities and your projected plans for developing professional personnel in this field, including program objectives, design and unique characteristics.

III. **Proposed Strategies**: Please describe your proposed plan and strategies for reaching your objectives, including staff, facilities, community and/or agency involvement ("agency" includes governmental, educational and philanthropic groups with which you plan to work).

IV. **Prospective Workshop Team**: *In the space below, please list the names, titles, and departments of four individuals who will attend the workshop if this proposal is selected. (The four-member team must include at least one special teacher-educator and one vocational teacher-educator.) Please attach each individual's vita to this proposal application.*

Name:	______________________	______________________
Title:	______________________	______________________
Department:	______________________	______________________
	(Vocational Educator)	*(Special Educator)*

Name:	______________________	______________________
Title:	______________________	______________________
Department:	______________________	______________________

V. **Supportive Statement** *(Please attach to this proposal at least one statement from a dean or department chairperson describing the administrative commitment given to preparing personnel to work with special needs students in vocational education. If the departments of vocational education and special education are in different schools/colleges within a university or in different universities, support statements from the respective deans would be desirable.)*

APPENDIX E

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE MINI-PROPOSAL

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING THE MINI-PROPOSAL

ELIGIBILITY

Any institution or consortium of institutions which is currently operating (or would like to develop) a cooperative personnel training program focused on preparing teachers, and/or coordinators to work effectively with special needs learners through some form of vocational programming, can submit a mini-proposal for workshop participation. (However, institutions which sent teams to the first workshop at the University of Illinois in January, 1976 will not be eligible to send teams to this second workshop). "Personnel training program" should be interpreted broadly here to include any or all of the following: courses, seminars, inservice workshops, field experience internships, and degree programs or options.

APPLICATION FORM AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION

The enclosed, three-page MINI-PROPOSAL form should be used in developing a proposal. Completed proposal forms should be mailed to the address identified below on or before September 8, 1976.

Dr. Rupert N. Evans
or Leonard Albright
284 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

(217) 333-4382

SELECTION PROCESS

Fifteen (15) applicants will be selected for participation in the national workshop by September 17, 1976. To insure national representation, one institution or consortium of institutions will be selected from each of the 10 U.S. Office of Education national regions. An additional selection of 5 institutions or consortia will be made without regard to geographic location. It is planned that a variety of personnel development programs will be selected. For instance, programs focusing on inservice or preservice preparation, as well as combinations of both will be considered. Unique arrangements for offering personnel training within a single university, and consortia of several institutions will also be considered.

In order to be considered for possible workshop participation each applicant must submit the enclosed mini-proposal (or a copy of it).

The information requested within the mini-proposal is designed to give the project staff a brief, but comprehensive overview of the existing and planned personnel training program, and the personnel involved in the cooperative team efforts. Therefore, in order to receive consideration, the submitting institutions must complete all sections of the mini-proposal.

APPENDIX F

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND INSTITUTIONS

1976-77 PARTICIPANT DIRECTORY
National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education

University of Illinois
October 26-28, 1976

REGION I

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE

Michael Williams
Industrial Arts Education
1615 Stanley Street
New Britain, Connecticut 06050

Robert Rinas
Vocational-Technical Ed. Department
1615 Stanley Street
New Britain, Connecticut 06050

David Dawson
Special Education Services
1615 Stanley Street
New Britain, Connecticut 06050

Paul Tarasak
Special Education Services
1615 Stanley Street
New Britain, Connecticut 06050

David Gifford
Connecticut State Dept. of Education
9 Clinton Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

KEENE STATE COLLEGE

Nancy Hartley
Vocational Special Needs
Cheshire House
Keene, New Hampshire 03431

Nancy Lorie
Clinic Coordinator
Elliot Hall
Keene, New Hampshire 03431

Dorothea Kitlan
Learning Resource Center
Keene, New Hampshire 03431

D l Ogg
Industrial Education Dept.
Keene, New Hampshire 03431

John Bean
Special Services
State Dept. of Education
105 Loudon Road
Concord, New Hampshire 03431

REGION II

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Joseph Castellana
Dept. of Educational Studies
OM 111
New Paltz, New York 12561

Paul Irvine
Special Education
BOCES, Putnam/N. Westchester
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

H. James Ross
Occupational Education
BOCES, Putnam/ N. Westchester
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Joseph Trippi
Special Education
OH 113
New Paltz, New York 12561

REGION III

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Frederick Ricci
Business/Distributive Education
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20740

Donald Maley
Dept. of Industrial Education
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20740

George Marx
Dept. of Counseling/Personnel Services
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20740

David Malouf
Special Education Dept.
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20740

John O'Brien
1401 Blair Mill Road
Silver Springs, Maryland 20910

WEST VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM

Le Vene Olson
Dept. of Occupational Education
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Iva Dean Cook
Special Education
College of Graduate Studies
Institute, West Virginia 25112

Sandra Barkey
Special Education
Kanawha Co. Board of Education
1900 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25303

George Culnon
Dept. of Vocational-Industrial Education
West Virginia Institute of Technology
Montgomery, West Virginia 25136

Jean Davis
West Va. State Dept. of Education
1189 Livingston Avenue
Charlestown, West Virginia 25302

REGION IV

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

Ray Sankovsky
Vocational Special Needs
115 Petrie Hall
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Max Joiner
Special Education Dept.
1116 Haley Center
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Sue Akers
Support Services
State Dept. of Education
868 State Office Bldg.
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Bob Hollis
Special Needs
State Dept. of Education
844 State Office Bldg.
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

SOUTH CAROLINA CONSORTIUM

James Daniels
Agricultural Education
107 Tillman Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Linda Parker
Exceptional Children Dept.
College of Education
Box 60
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Earl Carpenter
Agricultural Education
107 Tillman Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Walter Bailey
Career Development
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

REGION V

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Norman Ashcraft
Dept. of Industrial Education
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859

Frances Hallstrom
Special Education
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859

Ron Lutz
Dept. of Industrial Education
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859

Virginia Pearson
Special Education
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Jerry Wircenski
Industrial Education
Golden Engineering Labs
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Nancy Pollard
Special Education
South Campus Courts
Building E
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Betty Sawyers
Home Economics Education
South Campus Courts
Building F
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

James Legacy
Agricultural Education
South Campus Courts
Building G
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Larry Fosler
State Board of Voc-Tech Education
1532 Weber Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46227

REGION VI

PRAIRIE VIEW A & M

Harold Bonner
Community Affairs Center
Drawer A
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Juanita Carter
Special Education
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Ruby Bell
Box 2374
Prairie View, Texas 77445

William Kendall
Special Education
Prairie View, Texas 77445

REGION VII

DRAKE UNIVERSITY

Charles Greenwood
Education Department
302 Memorial Hall
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Karen Ford
Center for Teacher Education
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Marvin Fellers
College of Education
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

George Lair
Education Department
209 Memorial Hall
Des Moines, Iowa 50311

Robert Ford
Career Education
Dept. of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Merry E. Maitre
Special Education
Dept. of Public Instruction
330 Lindhardt Road
Carlisle, Iowa 50047

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

Gary Meers
Business Education
105 Bancroft Hall
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

Stanley Vasa
Special Education
204B Barkley Center
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

Robert Egbert
Dean's Office
101 Teachers College
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

Lee Witters
Special Education
204A Barkley Center
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

Steve Equall
State Dept. of Education
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

REGION VIII

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Curt Hiltbrunner
Career Education
3710 Synder Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Ace Cossairt
Special Education
418 Wyoming Hall
Laramie, Wyoming 82071

Dale Lemons
Vocational Education
Box 3374 University Station
Laramie, Wyoming 82071

Carl Reynolds
Vocational Education
Box 3374 University Station
Laramie, Wyoming 82071

REGION IX

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA - LAS VEGAS

Allen Mori
Special Education Dept.
4505 Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

Robert Harbach
Rehabilitation Dept.
4505 Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

Ray Ryan
Vocational Education Dept.
4505 Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

Annette Ezell
State Dept. of Education
400 W. King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710

REGION X

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

Glenn Madsen
Special Education
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Ron Frye
Vocational Education
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Bonnie Kern
ESP 109
20000 Cypress Way
Alderwood Manor, Washington 98036

Kent Neely
Vocational Department
Longview Public Schools
Longview, Washington 98632

Tom L. Warren
Educ. Services District 112
414 Studebaker Road
Castle Rock, Washington 98611

APPENDIX G

DISCUSSION MATRIX FOR ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

PRESSURE POINT WORKSHOP NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS TEACHER EDUCATION VIEWPOINT

ANALYSIS	LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY		UNIVERSITY	
DYNAMIC	CURRENT STIRRINGS	CONTRADICTIONS	TEACHER PREPARATION	PRESSURE POINT
THE OPERATIONAL WORLD .Administration .Personnel .Funding				
THE STUDENT WORLD .Assessment .Individual Educational Program .Placement				
THE TRAINING WORLD .Pre-vocational and Academic .Skill Development and Work Adjustment .Monitoring and Evaluation				
THE WORK WORLD .Job Marketing .Job Placement .Job Follow-up				

APPENDIX H

DISCUSSION MATRIX FOR DEVELOPING STRATEGIES

TASK FORCE WORKSHOP NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STRATEGIES TEACHER EDUCATION VIEWPOINT

PRESSURE POINT DESCRIPTION:

METHOD FORMS	COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES	CATALYTIC ROLE
TEACHER COMPETENCIES			
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT			
MEDIA AND MATERIALS			
PEDAGOGICAL METHODS			
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT			
FACULTY PREPARATION			

APPENDIX I

INSTITUTIONAL ACTION PLANNING INSTRUMENT

INSTITUTIONAL ACTION PLAN

for

____
(Descriptive Program Title)

at

____
(University(s))

Developed by:

*______________________________, ______________________________
(position)

______________________________, ______________________________

______________________________, ______________________________

______________________________, ______________________________

______________________________, ______________________________

*Team Captain and
Contact Person

at the

National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

October 26-28, 1976

Section 1: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

In this section, please describe the need for the proposed program, program revision or expansion by providing background information, as well as an analysis of situational and organizational variables and constraints.

Section 2: ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

In the space below, please outline the specific objectives for this undertaking. Enumerate the major observable and measurable outcomes of this plan of action on both a short-term (next 7 months), and long-term basis.

Long Term Objectives:

Short Term Objectives: (November to June 1, 1977)

Section 3: STRATEGIES

Please describe below the strategies your team will use to attain the objectives specified in Section 2. What activities will be engaged in by the team members, individually as well as collectively, during the next 7 months for attaining the short term objectives? For accomplishing the long term objectives?

Long Term Strategies:

Short Term Strategies: (November to June 1, 1977)

Section 4: RESOURCES

In the space below, please identify what resources (fiscal, staff, facilities) your team will draw upon or need to effectively implement this plan. State, as explicitly as possible, how your team would utilize any follow-up resources that the staff of the national project could provide.

Section 5: ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

In addition to the observable outcomes listed in the Action Plan Objectives (Section 2), please speculate regarding any additional benefits or outcomes your team foresees occurring as a result of developing and implementing this plan.

APPENDIX J

CROSS - REVIEW INSTRUMENT

Complete and return
to the Captain of
the plan reviewed.

ACTION PLAN
CROSS-REVIEW INSTRUMENT

Team Plan Name: ____

Reviewer: ____

Section 1 - Needs Assessment

Strengths:

Ideas for Improvement:

Section 2 - Action Plan Objectives

Strengths:

Ideas for Improvement:

Section 3 - Strategies

Strengths:

Ideas for Improvement:

Section 4 - Resources

Strengths:

Ideas for Improvement:

Section 5 - Anticipated Outcomes

Strengths:

Ideas for Improvement:

Reviewer Name________________

Address____________________

____

____

APPENDIX K

WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

DIRECTIONS: As part of our effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop, we would appreciate your completing this questionnaire. This information will be reported only as group data in reports written for the funding agency. Please do not sign your name as this is meant to be anonymous information. While we would like you to complete the entire questionnaire, you of course have complete freedom to refrain from responding to any part or all of it if you wish.

1. Of which small group (Tues, afternoon) were you a member? Please circle A B C D

2. Of which task force (Wed. morning) were you a member? ______________ (title of group)

3. The general objective of the workshop was to assist each participating team to prepare an "action plan" which could be used at their respective institution to refocus or expand the personnel preparation programs for vocational educators of special needs students. To what extent was this objective accomplished by the workshop program? (Circle one number)

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Well	Very Well	Somewhat	Very Little	Not at all

For the following statements, circle one response indicating how you feel about each statement. The "undecided" should be circled only when you have no opinion.

SA=Strongly agree; A=Agree; U=Undecided; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly disagree

SA A U D SD Meeting with individuals from other universities contributed significantly to our action planning.

SA A U D SD One of the most important contributions the workshop made was giving us a chance to spend concentrated time on planning our program.

SA A U D SD The workshop design encouraged the discussion of issues important to our program.

SA A U D SD Significant issues and strategies for developing teacher education programs were discussed in the small group sessions.

SA A U D SD The issues discussed in task force (Wed. morning) groups strengthened the framework on which we built our action plan.

SA A U D SD I personally made a contribution to the workshop effort.

SA A U D SD We probably would not have developed this type of teacher education plan if we had not participated in this workshop.

SA A U D SD The cross review session will be useful in preparing our revised Action Plan.

Please answer the following questions in the space provided.	Did this presentation directly relate to your action planning? Yes/No	Did this presentation compliment other topics discussed during this workshop? Yes/No	Was this presentation one that you would include in a future workshop of this emphasis? Yes/No	List the specific topics in this presentation that assisted your team with action planning.
Session I Tues. morning LEA Harberts/Booten VoEd-Evans SpecEd-Clark				
Session II Tues. afternoon Concept of Work-Broudy				
Session IV Tues. evening Legislation & Funding Petty/Halloran				
Session III Tues. afternoon Issue Identification				
Session V Wed. morning Task Forces				
Session VI Wed. afternoon Task Force Reports				
Session VII Thurs. morning Cross-Review				

WORKSHOP SESSION

Please check appropriate box concerning effect on action planning and give your comments/reasons for your feelings.

SESSIONS	EFFECT ON PLANNING				COMMENTS
	Much	Some	Little	None	
Local education agency perspective, Harberts/ Booten, Tues. morning					
Voc Ed. perspective, Evans, Tues. morning					
Spec Ed. perspective, Clark, Tues. morning					
Concept of Work, Broudy, Tues. morning					
Leg. and Funding Petty/Halloran, Tues. evening					
Issue Identification Engleman, Tues. afternoon					
Task Forces Engleman, Wed. morning					
Task Force Report Engleman, Wed. afternoon					
Cross Review of Action Plans, Thurs. morning					

Did you attend a mini session? Yes/No Which one? ____________________

In what ways was it of value? ____

____

Did you review the materials in the resource room? Yes/No

Did you or are you planning to use any of these materials as resources for your Action Plan? Yes/No

If you plan to order any of these materials, please list them.

____

____

Issues I wanted to discuss at the workshop but didn't have the opportunity to

are ____

____

In your opinion, what were one or two major strengths of this workshop?

In your opinion, what were one or two major weaknesses of this workshop?

If a workshop such as this is held again, will you recommend to your colleagues at other universities that they participate?

Yes Uncertain No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX L

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL DISPLAYED AT THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIALS

Presented at the National Workshop
on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education
University of Illinois
October 26-28, 1976

Atkins, Oscar T. "Introduction--Orientation to the World of Work Series." Kentucky Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Atkins, Oscar T., and Delaney, Judith. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit--Getting a Job." Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Borhani, R. (Ed.). "Kansas Resumes of Exemplary and Special Needs Programs in Vocational Education." Division of Vocational Education, Kansas Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas, 1975.

Burchinal, C.E. "A Guide and Policy Manual of Vocational Instruction and Supportive Services for Disadvantaged and Handicapped Persons." North Dakota Board for Vocational Education, 1976.

Carrano, A.S. "Development of Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped." Final Report. Connecticut State Department of Education--Bureau of Pupil Personnel and Special Educational Services, Hartford, Connecticut, 1976.

Carrano, A.S. "Final Report--Workshop of Vocational Education for the Handicapped in the Public Schools." Area Cooperative Educational Services, New Haven, Connecticut, 1976.

Craig, A. "Orientation to the World of Work: Handling Your Paycheck." Kentucky Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Educational Resources Center, "Guidelines for Program Development and Program Administration of Vocational Programs for Handicapped Secondary Students." Area Cooperative Educational Services, New Haven, Connecticut, 1976.

Evans, C. "Exploration in the World of Work Series--Unit, Exploring Business and Office Occupations." University of Kentucky Curriculum Development Center, Lexington, Kentucky, 1976.

Evans, C., and Wills, R. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit in Occupational Safety." Curriculum Development Center, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 1976.

Hanna, C., Project Director. "Project L.I.V.E.--Learning Involving Vocational Exposure." Final Report. Lawrence Central High School, Indiana, 1975.

Hull, Marc E.; Barry, Owen J.; Clark, Donald L. "Procedures for Teaching Vocational Concepts to Special Needs Students." Texas A & M University, Texas, 1976.

Johnson, J.L. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit Learning About Job Clusters." Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Karpinski, A. J., Project Director. "Pennsylvania Consortium for Training Special Education and Vocational Education Personnel." Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Lunsford, James. "Occupational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged/Handicapped." Division of Occupational Education, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, July, 1976.

Madsen, G. A. (Ed.) Programming Vocational Skills for the Handicapped. Central Washington State College, 1975.

Michigan Department of Education. "Guidelines for Vocational Education Programs for Persons With Special Needs." Disadvantaged and Handicapped Programs Unit, Vocational-Technical Educational Service, Michigan Department of Education, 1974.

Michigan Department of Education. "Michigan Inter-Agency Model and Delivery System of Vocational Education Services for the Handicapped." Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Michigan Department of Education.

New Jersey Department of Education. "Curriculum Materials for Vocational Technical Special Needs Career Education." (a catalog) Curriculum Laboratory, Rutgers, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1976.

Nordloh, Mary J. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit in Personal Development." State Department of Education, Kentucky and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Nordloh, M. J., and Sparks, M. C. "Exploration in the World of Work Series--Exploring Health Careers." Field Text Edition. Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

North Carolina Division of Occupational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged/Handicapped, "Occupational Education In-Service Series Programs for the Disadvantaged/Handicapped." Raleigh, North Carolina, 1976.

Oklahoma Central State University. "Coordinated Vocational Education and Training for Disadvantaged and Handicapped Youth." A Program Description. Edmond, Oklahoma.

Oklahoma Central State University. "Making Vocational Education Available to the Handicapped: An In-Service Teacher Education Program." Edmond, Oklahoma, 1975.

Phelps, L. Allen. "Competency-Based Inservice Education for Secondary School Personnel Serving Special Needs Students in Vocational Education: A Formative Field Test Evaluation." Final Report. Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1976.

Pinchak, G. J., and Marano, T. (eds.) "Selected Curriculum Materials for Disadvantaged Work Experience Programs." Distributive Education Materials Laboratory, Columbus, Ohio.

Rankin, L. T. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit: Taxes Affecting the Worker." Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Reynolds, M. Leroy, Project Director. "A Project to Train Vocational Education and Special Education Teachers to Work Cooperatively in Occupational Preparation of Handicapped Persons." Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, 1976.

Roundtree, Ray, and Anthony, Kenneth. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit in the Role of Work in our Society." Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Saddler, Dan. "Beginning Communication Skills." Prepared for North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Asheville Orthopedic Hospital, Spring 1976.

Saddler, Dan. "Using the Small Group Experience." Prepared for North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Asheville Orthopedic Hospital, Spring 1976.

Saddler, Dan. "Putting It All Together." North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Asheville Orthopedic Hospital, Spring 1976.

Sawyers, Bettye A.; Lee, Anne; Turner, Ruth (project codirectors). "A Brief Summary of a Vocational Education Summer Internship Program for Working with Disadvantaged Students." Department of Education, Purdue University, Indiana and Vocational Services, Indiana State University, Indiana, 1976.

Scott, E., and Love, D. "Orientation to the World of Work Unit in how to Keep a Job." Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Scott, E., and Sparks, M. C. "Exploring in the World of Work Series, Unit: Exploring Consumer, Homemaking, and Related Occupations." Field Test Edition. Kentucky State Department of Education and University of Kentucky, 1976.

Shigley, Ron. "An Overview of Vocational Evaluation." North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Asheville Orthopedic Hospital, Spring 1976.

Shigley, Ron J. "Appendix to Vocational Evaluation Report." Vocational Evaluation Unit, Orthopedic Hospital and Rehabilitation Center, Asheville, North Carolina, April, 1976.

Shigley, Ron J. "Developing a Work Sample." North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Asheville Orthopedic Hospital, Spring 1976.

Sievert, N. W., and Wircenski, J. L. "Summer Institutes for Teachers and Coordinators of Indiana's Special Needs Programs." Final Report. Purdue, University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 1973.

Smith, J. K. (preparer) "North Carolina State Mini Plan--Occupational Education Fiscal Year 1976." Field Support Section, Division of Occupational Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1975.

Sparks, M. C. "Orientation to the World of Work (teacher's handbook)." Curriculum Development Center, Lexington, Kentucky, June, 1974.

Strate, J. W. (Project Director) "In-Service for Coordinators of Cooperative Work Experience Programs." University of North Dakota, 1976.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Application for Grants Under Handicapped Research and Demonstration Program." [CFDA13.443] HEW, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. Closing Date: January 10, 1977. (Field Initiated Studies).

United State Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Application for Grants Under Handicapped Research and Demonstration Program." [CFDA13.443] HEW, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. Closing dates: December 1, 1976 and March 15, 1977. (Student Research).

Wargo, W. D. (Project Director) "Exploratory/Prevocational Learning Experiences for the Handicapped." Florida State University, 1976.

Weisman, L. "A Handbook for Developing Vocational Programs and Services for Disadvantaged Students." Southern Illinois University, 1976.

Williams, M. J. "Final Report of the Task Force on Vocational Education for the Handicapped." Central Connecticut State College, 1976.

Zikmund, Dale G. "Introduction to Special Vocational Needs." Course outline. Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1973.

Zikmund, Dale G. (Project Director) "Learning Resources for Students with Special Vocational Needs." Nebraska Vocational-Technical Curriculum Laboratory, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1974-1975.

Zikmund, Dale G. "Occupational Guideance for Special Vocational Needs." Course outline. Center for Vocational and Technical Education, School of Business, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1973.

Zikmund, Dale G. "Programming for Special Vocational Needs." Course outline. Center for Vocational and Technical Education, School of Business, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1973.

Zikmund, Dale G. (Project Director) "Supplement to Learning Resources for Students with Special Vocational Needs." Nebraska Vocational-Technical Curriculum Laboratory, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1975-1976.

Zikmund, Dale G. "Vocational Assessment and Work Evaluation." Course outline. Center for Vocational Technical Education, Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebraska, 1975.

APPENDIX M

TEAM PROGRESS REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

April 11, 1977

Workshop Team Captains:

Enclosed is the final team progress report form. We would like to receive input from as many members of your team as possible in order to reflect the opinion of your entire team. Ideally, you should schedule a team meeting to discuss and complete the questionnaire.

The final team progress report is in two parts. Part I concerns items which are common to all fifteen programs. This will describe the action your team has taken concerning selected program development activities. The second part focuses on accomplishments in relation to the specific objectives as described in your Action Plan. This information will assist us in developing some general recommendations regarding the processes used in the workshop. All data will be summarized across institutions without identifying which institutions are engaged in which activities. Of course, you will have the benefit of all these data which will be presented in our final report.

As stated in our letter dated January 14, 1977, the final team progress report is due on May 20, 1977 along with your billing report. Submit the billing report to:

Purchasing Division
223 Administration Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Please return the enclosed team progress report to our office (Room 288 Education Building) no later than May 20, 1977.

Your assistance and prompt action regarding the completion of the final team progress report will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kurt Braun
Project Coordinator

KB:sl

Enclosure

Due May 20, 1977
Return to:
Kurt Braun
288 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

FINAL TEAM PROGRESS REPORT

National Workshop on Special Needs Vocational Teacher Education

Bureau of Educational Research
University of Illinois
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois

INSTITUTION/CONSORTIUM: ______________________________

Team Members Signatures

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

In order to determine the impact of the national workshop upon university personnel preparation programs concerning vocational programming for special needs students, it is important for your entire team to respond to this questionnaire as a group.

For each of the items listed on the following pages, please check (✓) one that best describes the action taken at your university(ies) in relation to Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students. Respond with comments as you feel necessary.

PART I

Section A

Course/Program Development Concerning Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/ Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	*Comment as necessary*
1. Identification of teacher competencies for vocational programming of special needs students						
2. Advisory/steering committee for course development						
3a. Proposal for introductory preservice or inservice course						
b. Presentation of proposal for introductory course to appropriate curriculum approving committee						
4a. Proposal for advanced (e.g. methods) course for preservice or inservice						
b. Presentation of proposal for advanced course to appropriate curriculum approving committees						
5. Procurement of resource materials for teaching courses/workshop						
6. Evaluation/revision of present courses or programs						
7. Advisory/steering committee for degree program						
8a. Development of proposal for undergraduate degree program						
b. Submission of proposal for undergrad degree program for approval						

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/ Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary
2. Joint departmental/university committees (sp ed/voc ed) Please List Committees: ____________________ ____________________ ____________________						
3. Other communication/cooperative activities Please List Activities: ____________________ ____________________ ____________________						
Section E Workshop Concerning Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students						
1. Proposal written						
2. Proposal submitted						
3. Steering committee for workshop development						
4. Workshop program developed						
5. Workshop information dissemination						
6. Workshop conducted						
7. Workshop evaluated						

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/ Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary
9a. Development of Proposal for Graduate degree program						
b. Submission of proposal for graduate degree program for approval						

Section B

Staff to Implement Course(s) Program(s) (related to Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students)

1. Present faculty competencies evaluated?					
2. Job description of position(s) desired					
3. Search committee(s) for position(s)					

Section C

Exploration of Funding Sources for Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students

1. Local/University Sources For: Inservice workshops					
Research					
Curriculum development					
Planning committee meetings					

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/ Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary
2. State Sources For: Inservice workshops						
Research						
Curriculum development						
Planning committee meetings						
3. Federal Sources For: Inservice workshops						
Research						
Curriculum development						
Planning committee meetings						

Section D

Communication/Cooperation Concerning Vocational Programming for Special Needs Students.

1. Joint departmental/university meetings (sp ed/voc ed faculty invited)					

How many meetings have been held:

before workshop ________

since workshop ________

PART II

I. Please list and describe the activities and accomplishments of your team in relation to the short term objectives as described in your Action Plan.

In addition, please briefly describe any problems which have tended to impede accomplishments of your short term objectives and also when the problem occurred (e.g., prior to workshop, continuing, etc.).

2. Please list and describe the activities and accomplishments of your team in relation to the long term objectives as described in your Action Plan.

In addition, please briefly describe any problems which have tended to impede accomplishment of your long term objectives and also when the problem occurred, (e.g., prior to workshop, continuing, etc.).

3. Please briefly describe any other impact (not previously mentioned in this questionnaire) upon your institution(s) which has occurred as a result of participation in the national workshop.

4. After trying to implement your Action Plan, would your team now have any conclusions about the feasibility of your plan, or would you now make any revisions. (If so, please describe.)